



109335.4²⁵

N.3



GIVEN BY

U. S. SUP^T. OF DOCUMENTS

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA
ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SPECIAL

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

THIRD SESSION

ON

H. Res. 282

TO INVESTIGATE (1) THE EXTENT, CHARACTER, AND OBJECTS OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, (2) THE DIFFUSION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES OF SUBVERSIVE AND UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA THAT IS INSTIGATED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES OR OF A DOMESTIC ORIGIN AND ATTACKS THE PRINCIPLE OF THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT AS GUARANTEED BY OUR CONSTITUTION, AND (3) ALL OTHER QUESTIONS IN RELATION THERETO THAT WOULD AID CONGRESS IN ANY NECESSARY REMEDIAL LEGISLATION

VOLUME 3

OCTOBER 24, 25, 26, 27

NOVEMBER 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 1938

AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

Printed for the use of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1939

6804

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

Special
SPECIAL

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

THIRD SESSION

ON

H. Res. 282

TO INVESTIGATE (1) THE EXTENT, CHARACTER, AND OBJECTS OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, (2) THE DIFFUSION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES OF SUBVERSIVE AND UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA THAT IS INSTIGATED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES OR OF A DOMESTIC ORIGIN AND ATTACKS THE PRINCIPLE OF THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT AS GUARANTEED BY OUR CONSTITUTION, AND (3) ALL OTHER QUESTIONS IN RELATION THERETO THAT WOULD AID CONGRESS IN ANY NECESSARY REMEDIAL LEGISLATION

VOLUME 3

OCTOBER 24, 25, 26, 27

NOVEMBER 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 1938

AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

Printed for the use of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1939

x 9335-4A25
v.3

Feb 29, 1950

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

MARTIN DIES, Texas, *Chairman*

ARTHUR D. HEALEY, Massachusetts

NOAH M. MASON, Illinois

JOHN J. DEMPSEY, New Mexico

J. PARNELL THOMAS, New Jersey

JOE STARNES, Alabama

HAROLD G. MOSIER, Ohio

ROBERT E. STRIPLING, *Secretary*

II

Charged to credit acct.
with Supt. of Documents

YASSEL OLIVER
387 70
NO 12 30 1950

CONTENTS

Statement of—	Page.
Abele, Lester J.-----	2109
Cobb, James A.-----	2142
Creighton, J. H.-----	2063
De Sola, Ralph-----	2396
Dobrzynski, Zygmund-----	2207
Eagar, Richard-----	2319
Halpern, Robert E.-----	2389
Hannon, Joseph F.-----	2046
Herzog, Edgar J.-----	2086
Hofmann, Bernhard-----	2118
Knowles, Harper L.-----	1717, 1953
Leib, Joseph-----	2202
McCartney, Felix (Pat) J.-----	2289
Matthews, J. B.-----	2163
Metalfe, John C.-----	2117, 2235, 2287, 2337
Nimmo, Ray E.-----	1717, 1953
Pace, John T.-----	2266, 2316
Schulz, Le Roy-----	2129
Sparks, C. Nelson-----	2246
Suteliffe, C. V.-----	2416
Communication from—	
Bonham, R. P., Seattle District Immigration Director-----	2075
Dies, Hon. Martin, chairman, to Secretary of Labor-----	2075
Dies, Hon. Martin, chairman, to Solicitor General, Department of Justice-----	2075
Kent, Arthur James, affidavit-----	2083
Perkins, Hon. Frances, Secretary of Labor-----	2081

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1938

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,

Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman has not decided just when we will hear Mr. R. P. Bonham, director of immigration for the Seattle district, but he will be here in a short time.

The files of the Department of Labor disclosed some very serious accusations that Mr. Bonham has made with reference to the *Bridges case*, and I might say that some of this correspondence will be made public and placed in the record, with reference to the *Harry Bridges case*.

The first is a telegram dated April 19, 1938, from R. P. Bonham to the United States Department of Labor. That telegram is addressed to Mr. Houghteling. The telegram is dated April 19, 1938, and reads as follows:

Radio news announces your continuance Bridges hearing until Supreme Court decides New Orleans case. Hope this is incorrect, as difficult protect our witnesses indefinitely. I have examined entire record testimony and the court's decision said case. Service failed introduce adequate proof party teaches violence. We have ample such evidence both in current official party documents and on part of witnesses. New Orleans case weak and devoid proper proof, therefore, not hurtful or controlling our case. Hope same will not be regarded as precedent or of sufficient consequence postpone pending case. Please wire instructions.

BONHAM.

While waiting for Mr. Starnes, I will read this letter: This letter is addressed to Mr. Houghteling by Mr. Bonham:

DEAR MR. HOUGHTELING: The *Streckler case* is very weak, consisting more of inferences than evidence. The court's decision is based, I think, upon the proposition that we cannot deport just because an alien is proved to be a member of the Communist Party, but we must also prove that said organization teaches or prints or displays matter advocating violent overthrow of our Government. The case rests only on the absence of such facts or proof, and not upon any fundamental question. The case was "remanded for further proceedings;" what could that mean except for evidence of violent revolution doctrines of the said organization? An appeal will not cure the situation, in my judgment, but rather complicate it.

That letter is signed by R. P. Bonham, district director.

Mr. R. P. Bonham was the district director for that particular district in which Harry Bridges resides, and he is the man who

had charge of the case and the procurement of the evidence with reference to it. They have district directors stationed throughout the United States, and he is in charge of that entire area, and had charge of the *Bridges case*.

There is a good deal of other correspondence that took place from time to time, including a letter from Mr. Bonham to Mr. Houghteling, who is a representative of the Secretary of Labor, I believe, in which he says that Harry Bridges came to his office and made the statement that he knew what was going on, and had access to the files of the Department.

For obvious reasons, the committee will not divulge the names of any of these witnesses whose depositions appear in these files. There are numerous depositions. These are depositions by people who swear that Harry Bridges was a Communist, that they had seen him attending meetings of the Communist Party, and that they heard him make speeches in which he himself advocated revolution. They testified that they heard him advocate sabotage. In all the testimony, the *Bridges case* is clearly distinguished from the *Strecker case*.

In the *Strecker case* the court simply held that membership in the Communist Party standing alone was not sufficient ground for deportation of a Communist alien, but that they must go further and show that the Communist Party teaches the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. It was for that reason that 4 years ago, in an attempt to correct that difficulty, the Chair introduced and secured the passage through the House of Representatives of a bill clarifying the situation by declaring that membership in the Communist Party alone was sufficient. That bill was defeated in the Senate through a filibuster conducted by Senator Robert M. La Follette. Then, in the *Strecker case*, the circuit court of appeals held contrary to the decisions of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and held that they would have to go further and prove that he was a Communist, that he advocated force and violence, and belonged to a party that advocated force and violence.

I make this statement while we are waiting so there may be a clear understanding of some of the issues we are going into. The *Strecker case* is only typical of a number of other cases that we have evidence on. The *Strecker case* is probably the most publicized one; but there are many others. The case of Joseph Kowalsky, of Detroit, is almost identical. He was at one time deported to Russia, and was there for 2 years. He was a member of the Chika, and then came back to the United States. He has been arrested many times by the local police, but never deported again. In addition to the *Joseph Kowalsky case*, there are a number of other cases where the police made arrests, where deportation was sought, but was refused. The Chair requested the Department of Labor to send us the record of 2,000 cases in which deportation proceedings were instituted, so that upon examination of the files, we may determine how many Communists there are in the United States that stand in that situation. We know that there are some seven or eight that are in the same category with the *Harry Bridges case*.

While waiting, I will also make public the letter dated September 23, 1937, to Edward J. Shaughnessy, Assistant Commissioner of Immi-

gration, Department of Labor, from R. P. Bonham, district director, as follows:

Submitted herewith please find application for warrant arrest, with most unusual supporting evidence, in the matter of Harry Renton Bridges. The testimony of ———, who has been for a long time closely associated with Bridges and intimately affiliated with the Communist Party and active in their plans, acting under orders of ——— is of great importance, and completes belief and the presentation of this application to the Department. The warrant when issued should be forwarded to the Portland office as the witnesses shown in the application are all within the locality.

I believe it is proper that I acquaint the central office with the fact that when I interviewed Mr. Bridges some time ago on another matter, he boasted that he had seen the central office's file relating to himself, and also that, "They" had an excellent intelligence organization of their own that kept them well informed of what was going on. Several of the witnesses in behalf of the Government are fearful of their lives, if ahead of the hearing the fact of their having testified becomes known to the aliens or the Communists. There will be no "leak" at this end and may I not, in order that their lives may not be unduly endangered, adjure the central office and the Department to observe the greatest precautions to safeguard inviolate this record.

This is signed by R. P. Bonham, district director.

TESTIMONY OF HARPER L. KNOWLES AND RAY E. NIMMO

(The witnesses were duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. The first witness is Mr. Harper L. Knowles. Mr. Knowles, you are chairman of the——

Mr. KNOWLES (interposing). Of the radical research committee of the American Legion, Department of California.

The CHAIRMAN. And the other gentleman's name is Ray E. Nimmo.

Mr. NIMMO. Yes, sir.

Mr. KNOWLES. He is serving as counsel for me.

The CHAIRMAN. He is serving as counsel for you in the Americanization committee.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Who wants to testify first?

Mr. NIMMO. Mr. Chairman, I might say that I do not know, of course, the manner in which the committee usually proceeds, because I have not attended any of your hearings; but in connection with this matter, for the American Legion, Department of California, we have prepared a great mass of material pertaining, not alone to the *Bridges case*, but to the infiltration of Communists into a majority of the activities on the west coast.

The CHAIRMAN. You have prepared an exhaustive brief dealing with subversive activities on the west coast?

Mr. NIMMO. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That brief is supported by numerous affidavits, and you have requested that the names of the witnesses be withheld in connection with this material dealing with the *Bridges case* until the subcommittee goes to the west coast, at which time the witnesses will be introduced, or a large number of them, to substantiate all of the things stated in your brief; is that correct?

Mr. NIMMO. That is correct. I might amplify that by saying that these briefs are on different phases of the Communist situation on the west coast, and I am going to take up the first so the committee may entertain the introduction of the two briefs that we call the basic briefs which we will not touch upon today, but will merely show them

to the committee in order to show the ground work on which we have proceeded in the matter of the procedure of the Communist Party, or the organization of the Communist Party, those being matters that you are completely familiar with. Still, we want to introduce that to show the ground work on which we have proceeded.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that this investigation has been going on for a considerable length of time.

Mr. NIMMO. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. With the active support of Legionnaires from all over the State.

Mr. NIMMO. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When Mr. Starnes goes to California with his subcommittee there will be available a large number of witnesses to support the investigation that you have made.

Mr. NIMMO. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. We will then have an opportunity to go into full details which, obviously, cannot be done here. In the meanwhile we feel that it is absolutely essential that the list of witnesses be retained as confidential because otherwise we feel that they would be jeopardized in their lives and property.

I want to say further that the first brief that we want to consider is the one labeled "Maritime Brief." That is a very extensive brief. We have two copies of it here for the committee, which I will present now, and I have other copies if the committee desires to have them.

The CHAIRMAN. This brief deals also with Harry Bridges.

Mr. NIMMO. The maritime brief and the *Bridges case* are interlocked completely throughout.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you proceed with the first phase dealing with the maritime situation. I see that you have a brief containing some 150 and odd pages. How do you propose to use this as the hearing proceeds?

Mr. NIMMO. We propose to do this: You have, of course, copies of the briefs. That may be a misnomer; they are really current narrative statements of the entire situation, referring particularly to the exhibits that we propose to introduce at the proper time. We propose this morning, if agreeable to the committee, through the testimony of Mr. Knowles, which I will attempt to bring out, if the chairman desires, to show the high lights of the situation. That is all we can do today.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you will introduce the full brief for amplification of what you will bring out?

Mr. NIMMO. Yes, sir. The briefs are introduced. They may now be considered as introduced.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you proceed. This is somewhat unusual, but in view of the fact that it is such an important matter, I think that it will be perfectly all right to proceed in the way you suggest.

Mr. NIMMO. If agreeable to you, I think we can bring it out more quickly in this way.

Mr. Knowles has been sworn as a witness and I will ask, first, or, perhaps, the record already shows, that he is chairman of the radical research committee of the American Legion, for the Department of California. Under their direction, this investigation was made, and we are producing this brief, only two copies of which thus far have been presented. This testimony has been gathered over a period of many months, and Mr. Knowles, being the chairman of the com-

mittee, has prepared the highlights of the entire matter. I would like to make this further statement that I am not entirely familiar with all the data because of the great mass of detailed matter in it, but I am trying to assist the committee and assist Mr. Knowles in the presentation of it.

I will ask Mr. Knowles, first, in a general way what work has been done, according to your knowledge, by the American Legion during the last 2 or 3 years.

MR. KNOWLES. In 1934, following serious disturbance in California that were obviously incited by Communists, the American Legion set up what was termed the "subversive activities commission," consisting of members of the American Legion from various sections of the State of California, for which it was my honor to act as chairman during the years 1935 and 1936, and following that year as chairman of the radical research committee, a subcommittee of the American commission. I have served on that committee for the last 2 years. The committee is composed of approximately nine active members who are scattered from Eureka to Imperial County on the south. Some of them served in official capacities in police departments. Two were chiefs of police, and others were connected at various places in commercial life. We have attempted to gather in that 4 years a mass of detailed reports, clippings, literature, and so forth, on various phases of subversive activities. We have not alone concerned ourselves with Communist activities, but, also, with the question of the infiltration of nazi-ism and fascism, in the subordinate way that it has, on the Pacific coast. We desire to present that to the committee in brief form.

MR. NIMMO. I will ask you whether or not this information you have received indicates that the Communist group has worked along distinctly party lines with the Communist Party during the last decade.

MR. KNOWLES. Very definitely. As indicated in the general brief, or basic brief, and, also, in the maritime brief, we will indicate that the action of the party, especially in the general strike, has been revolutionary, as carried out through the maritime members. In other words, they advocated all manner of schemes which were contrary to our theories and doctrines of government.

MR. NIMMO. I will ask you whether or not there was a maritime strike in 1934 on the water front out there?

MR. KNOWLES. Yes, sir; there was.

MR. NIMMO. And whether that was followed by a general strike in the city of San Francisco.

MR. KNOWLES. It was, in July of that same year.

MR. NIMMO. And whether your investigation developed that the general strike grew out of the maritime strike.

MR. KNOWLES. Very definitely.

MR. NIMMO. And whether or not you know who was the chairman of the strike committee at the time of the general strike?

MR. KNOWLES. The chairman of the strike committee was none other than Harry Bridges, whose true name is Alfred Renton Bridges.

THE CHAIRMAN. Did I understand you to say he was the chairman of the general strike committee?

Mr. KNOWLES. The general strike committee; yes, sir.

Mr. NIMMO. Alfred Renton Bridges is his true name, and he is popularly or unpopularly known as Harry Bridges; is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIMMO. Do you know whether or not he is an alien?

Mr. KNOWLES. He is an Australian. He came to this country in April 1920.

Mr. NIMMO. Since his activities began in this country he has been connected with labor organizations, has he not?

Mr. KNOWLES. Since he entered this country, and in fact before he entered this country, he was engaged in activities in labor circles, going through various offices in maritime circles, and he is at the present time president of the West Coast Committee for Industrial Organization.

Mr. NIMMO. He has been president of the International Longshoremen's Association, has he not?

Mr. KNOWLES. He has.

Mr. NIMMO. And also past president of district No. 2 of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific Coast?

Mr. KNOWLES. At a later date.

Mr. NIMMO. And he is also director of the C. I. O. on the Pacific coast?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right.

Mr. NIMMO. Now, Mr. Knowles, will your investigation disclose that he is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct, sir.

Mr. NIMMO. And that can be established by the testimony of witnesses who have sat in Communist Party meetings with him?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right.

Mr. NIMMO. Upon more than one occasion?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIMMO. Do you know whether, in October 1922, Bridges entered the Riggers and Stevedores Union and grouped about him a radical clan at that time?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct. That group began to agitate on the water front approximately in 1932.

Mr. NIMMO. Do you mind developing how long it continued, and what it consisted of, just briefly?

Mr. KNOWLES. They saw at that time that it was impossible for them to gain headway and decided to organize a longshoremen's local union. To do this a group was set up, which we will call the "Equality Hall" group, which met at 147 Albion Street, San Francisco.

Mr. NIMMO. Pardon me, Mr. Knowles. The name of that building was Equality Hall?

Mr. KNOWLES. Equality Hall.

Mr. NIMMO. And throughout your studies, this Equality Hall group is brought into the picture from time to time?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct. We will try to indicate that this concise group governed the actions of the radical group on the waterfront from that time on up to and including the present.

Mr. NIMMO. And that continued on through until the general strike, and since that time?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. NIMMO. And the general strike occurred in the summer of 1934?

Mr. KNOWLES. In the summer of 1934.

Mr. NIMMO. Now, one of the first efforts of the Bridges group, or the Equality Hall group, was in connection with the deposing of the president of the International Longshoremen's Association, was it not?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct; and they immediately asked for a new concession so far as wages and hours and the like, of the employers.

Mr. NIMMO. And they were successful in deposing the president, were they not?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIMMO. Are you acquainted with the paper or publication which is known as the Waterfront Worker?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIMMO. Which is used by this Equality Hall group?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIMMO. Do you mind referring to that publication?

Mr. KNOWLES. We introduce herewith the file of the bulletin called Waterfront Worker, which we offer as maritime exhibit No. 1-A.

This Waterfront Worker was presented to the men on the waterfront as a rank-and-file bulletin by the Equality Hall group. The attention of the committee is called to volume 1, No. 1, of January 1933. Please note that it is issued by "A group of longshoremen with the cooperation of the Marine Workers Industrial Union."

Mr. NIMMO. And this Marine Workers Industrial Union, which is more widely known as the M. W. I. U., is admittedly a Communist organization, is it not?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct. Formerly membership in it would subject an alien to deportation.

Mr. NIMMO. Then there was another publication at one time called the Western Worker, was there not?

Mr. KNOWLES. The Western Worker was the western organ of the Communist Party, and so stated on its banner.

Mr. NIMMO. And in connection with this exhibit that you have referred to, there is a place in that exhibit where they have introduced the title on the top of the page, "Western Worker," instead of "Waterfront Worker;" is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. NIMMO. Indicating that it was published by the same Communist group?

Mr. KNOWLES. Volume IV, I believe it is, No. 10. At the top of the page, instead of having the banner "Waterfront Worker," whoever set it up set it up as the "Western Worker"—quite obviously a typographical error, but indicating that he had the other in mind.

Mr. NIMMO. Now, there was a Communist Party convention in San Francisco in November 1935, was there not, Mr. Knowles?

Mr. KNOWLES. There was, sir.

Mr. NIMMO. And at that time do you recollect that there was a program mimeographed for distribution to the Communist Party?

Mr. KNOWLES. There was. We have a copy in our files, and I believe a printed copy is present here.

We offer here a copy of Program Adopted at the State Communist Party Convention in San Francisco, November 24, 1935. This is an original as mimeographed for distribution by the party. We ask that it be marked "Exhibit 2."

Your attention is directed to the subheading "Rank-and-File Bulletins" from under which we quote:

Below is a partial list of the Rank-and-File Bulletins now being issued by our party sections throughout the State, and including some of the more important national bulletins:

San Francisco—Waterfront Worker (I. L. A.), Box 1158.

Mr. NIMMO. Mr. Knowles, do you know in whose name that post-office box 1158 was originally taken out?

Mr. KNOWLES. It was taken out in the name of the Waterfront Worker, and also taken out in the name of Harry Gliksohn, which is an alias for Harry Jackson.

Mr. NIMMO. Who was Harry Jackson, if you know?

Mr. KNOWLES. Harry Jackson was a very active member on the San Francisco water front, and at the present time is the trade-union organizer for the Pacific Northwest in district 12.

Mr. NIMMO. Is he a Communist?

Mr. KNOWLES. He is a Communist.

Mr. NIMMO. Do you know a man named Roy Hudson?

Mr. KNOWLES. Roy Hudson is a member of the central committee of the Communist Party of the United States, and I have here two letters written to Harry Jackson under the dates of February 5 and 8, directing the policy of the Waterfront Worker—photostatic copies.

Mr. NIMMO. This Waterfront Worker being a Communist sheet, and organized in connection with the labor conditions on the coast at that time?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct.

Mr. NIMMO. Now, do you mind referring to the letter of February 5 from Hudson to Jackson, and indicating what that discloses with reference to what Jackson was doing at that time in San Francisco; what his work was in the International Longshoremen's Association in connection with Communist activities and the Communist Party?

Mr. KNOWLES. He was writing articles for the Waterfront Worker, and it was desired that he also contribute articles to the Voice of Action, a Communist paper in the East.

I quote in part from the letter of February 5, 1934:

It sure was too bad that I did not have the material sent out by the International Longshoremen's Association before we went to Washington—especially the one containing the telegram to Ryan insisting upon their demands for a \$1 hour—if he had of had this one—or known about it—we would have presented it there and it would have been dynamite.

Yes; I'm raising hell about no articles from you—and still don't think you can get out of it by passing the buck to Telford. You can write and the articles contained in the Waterfront Worker are God-damn good—and there is no reason why we can't get some for the Voice.

In connection with the Northwest—the reports that I received from there are fairly encouraging and some progress is to be recorded. I believe that now is a very opportune time for you to go up there—not only will you be able to stimulate the work but also will be able to clarify some problems that are developing there in regard to methods of work, etc. One thing that must be done is to put the work inside the International Longshoremen's Association on a more definite oppositional basis, in the sense that it will function through the medium of the opposition group and not solely through the channels of our union.

This letter points out three things: First, that Harry Jackson was operating in San Francisco with the I. L. A., on behalf of the Communist Party in the Maritime Workers' Industrial Union; secondly, in the second paragraph quoted it points out the contact between Sam Telford, known Communist Party member, and also the fact that Harry Jackson was writing articles for the Waterfront Worker; thirdly, it shows the connection with the Northwest, together with an order to Jackson to go to the Northwest, meaning Oregon and Washington. It is interesting to note that already in this brief the committee will find that the same Harry Jackson is now organizer to the twelfth district of the Communist Party, which comprises Oregon and Washington.

We now quote from the letter of February 8, 1934, in part:

The news you write regarding the response of the Northwest to the convention is very good—and the rank and file delegation that went up certainly seems to indicate that our policies are getting root. I trust that we are consolidating a real firm opposition group. In view of the International Longshoremen's Association stand at the code hearings we certainly should be able to make headway all around—and should give an impetus to the convention. There is little to add upon my previous remarks and the wire concerning the stand of the officials. * * * It is doubtful whether we will be able to get minutes of this hearing in view of my failure to pay the \$80 for the last one * * * in case I do get them will shoot them right out. I agree with you that the place where the convention should be held should not become a breaking point—although it would be much more favorable if it were held in 'Frisco.

Now, Harry, in connection with your statement on Mink. This statement will not be taken up in the fraction—and in my letter of December 15 I told you that if you thought you must raise objections, it should be through the center.

I want to make myself very clear on this—especially in view of your statement in the letter accompanying the statement. It is unfortunate that you don't keep carbon copies, so therefore, I will quote from your letter to make myself clear. You state "and we will not let anyone's petty politics take away from us capable forces, etc. * * * I refer to Stachel in particular."

From this you frankly state that George is where he is because of "someone's petty politics." I have the utmost confidence in you, Jackson, and under no circumstances would I accuse you of factionalism—but, frankly, this is only speculating on decisions and trying to find "factional" reasons, or "petty political" reasons for them being made. We must not only reject "petty politics," but we must just as severely reject tendencies that see petty politics in every decision.

Again, why were the reasons he went: First, he proposed, very strongly, himself; second, an even greater insistence upon the part of Ray—who, when it looked like George might not go, raised particular hell. There were other factors, but these were the basic ones, and if there is any petty politics in them I will eat my hat.

Now final reasons why your recommendation is not going to be raised in the fraction: First, recommendations came from top fraction—final decisions made by P. B.—and this year a stronger insistence that the candidates not become public property. Very few people know who they are—incidentally you should not have been informed—and I had hell raised with me already because people knew who shouldn't. Therefore, to raise it in the fraction would be incorrect. Second, fraction meetings—and buro have been held—and no one has raised any objections and agreed with the formal "proposal" for his temporary leave.

I have other ideas on the whole subject, but I believe the above make it clear why I take the stand I do, and I hope you will understand them and the spirit I make them, even though there might be some sharp criticism. * * * I still insist that the decision was a correct one and that you have no basis upon which to raise serious objections. However, if you are still of the same opinion, then you should and must raise them directly with the center. But under no circumstances is the question of where George is at to be raised with anyone on the coast.

Paragraph 1 shows the continued headway that the party was making in the I. L. A., and the rest of the portion quoted is a very clear exposition of the methods of the party and its functional operation.

In paragraph 11 the committee's attention is called to the words, "final decisions made by P. B." This is the political bureau of the central committee of the Communist Party.

The committee is requested at this time to call the witnesses designated in the list of witnesses appended to this brief, and to ask the witnesses the questions submitted in appendix B.

Mr. NIMMO. Do you know a man named Sam Telford in connection with that?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir: Sam Telford is mentioned here as part of the group who are doing that.

Mr. NIMMO. And he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KNOWLES. He was a member of the Communist Party as well.

Mr. NIMMO. Now will you refer to a book which is known as *Men Who Lead Labor*, and which has been designated for the convenience of the committee as "Exhibit No. 3"?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

We now offer the book entitled "*Men Who Lead Labor*," written by Bruce Minton and John Stuart. We request that it be marked "Exhibit 3." Both Minton and Stuart are Communist Party members, and a reference to pages 180 and 181 indicates Harry Bridges' connection with the *Waterfront Worker*.

We also introduce the Communist-controlled magazine, *New Masses*, issue of May 3, 1938, as exhibit 4.

Exhibit 4 was purchased in the Communist Party book store located at 226½ South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif., and the clerk admitted it to be a recognized Communist publication. On page 8 thereof we find that Bruce Minton is an editor of *New Masses*. He is further known to be a member of the Communist Party. On page 19 there is an article entitled "The Moscow Trials, a Statement by American Progressives." In the list of signers to this article we find the name of the coauthor of *Men Who Lead Labor*, John Stuart. He is also known to be a member of the Communist Party. This proof is offered to show that the authors of *Men Who Lead Labor* are Communist Party affiliates and that the articles therein represent the Communist Party position.

Attention is now called to the page of acknowledgments in exhibit 3, *Men Who Lead Labor*. We cite the two referred to from the Pacific coast: Lawrence Emery and Herbert Resner:

Lawrence Emery was arrested for industrial sabotage and sentenced to San Quentin Prison, State of California, from Imperial County. He admitted that he was a Communist and is now the educational director of Detroit district of the Communist Party.

Herbert Resner, now secretary of the Tom Mooney Defense Committee, succeeding Arthur Kent. Both are members of the Communist Party. Resner is a member of the lawyers' unit of the professional section of the Communist Party in San Francisco.

It is from these two that much of the material on Harry Bridges, *Voice of the Rank-and-File*, an article in *Men Who Lead Labor*, is written.

In order to properly place the others acknowledged, we state as follows:

Louis Budenz, a member of the staff of the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, U. S. A., section, Communist International.

Theodore Draper, coeditor of New Masses, a recognized Communist Party magazine.

Granville Hicks, professor of Harvard University and an admitted Communist.

Robert W. Dunn, head of the Labor Research Association and an admitted Communist.

Grace Hutchins, member of Labor Research Association and an admitted Communist.

Hy Kravif, member of Labor Research Association and an admitted Communist.

Our introduction of Men Who Lead Labor at this time is to quote from pages 180 and 181 thereof:

In 1924 he (Bridges) and a few others organized a local * * *. By 1932 conditions on the docks had become so bad that the small group of militants decided to launch a third attempt to build the International Longshoremen's Association. The handful of "progressives" published a mimeographed, clumsily constructed little bulletin which they called the "Waterfront Worker."

The Marine Workers Industrial Union, affiliated with the Trade Union Unity League, lent powerful aid to the agitation for organization.

We now offer a folio of eight dodgers as follows: "Call for Unity Conference," June 25, 1933; "Notice to All Longshoremen," October 8, 1933; "Who Are the Communists?" December 1933; "How We Stand," December 1933; "Mass Meeting," December 28, 1933; "Workers' International Relief," March 5, 1934; "Will Paddy Morris Dare?," March 11, 1934; "The Battle Rages," April 25, 1934, and request the folio be marked "Exhibit 5."

Mr. NIMMO. Now, Mr. Knowles, will you refer to our maritime brief on page 12, where we have attempted to indicate what is charged by the research committee of the American Legion?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Our charges are as follows:

1. That the Equality Hall group existed as charged.
2. That it commenced the agitation that brought about the San Francisco general strike and chaos to the maritime industry.
3. That it did its agitation by means of the Waterfront Worker and dodgers.
4. That it was headed by Harry Bridges.
5. That the Communist Party declares in exhibit 2 that Harry Bridges and his group who issued the Waterfront Worker were members of the water-front section of the Communist Party.
6. That the Communist-controlled Maritime Workers' Industrial Union was placed at Bridges' disposal and that he accepted and affiliated with their work.

We desire to point out that the men who were instrumental in working out the program at the Equity Hall meetings are, for the greater part, holding key positions at the present time in the Maritime Federation of the Pacific.

If the committee cares for me to do so, I will give a thumbnail sketch of the members of that group.

The CHAIRMAN. It might be interesting.

Mr. KNOWLES. Henry Schmidt: Schmidt is now the president of Local 1-10, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, a C. I. O. affiliate.

That is hardly true as of today, but as of September 15, when this was written, it was correct. He is now out of office.

He has been a member of the Communist Party. Affiliation not known at the date of this report. He is a right-hand man of Mr. Bridges, a German naturalized citizen who is quiet, forceful, and competent. It is quite probable that Schmidt's advice to Bridges makes one of the Bridges' effective means for advancement. Schmidt has control of the subject matter of the Waterfront Worker. He is married.

Henry Schrimpf: Schrimpf is a radical. He was formerly a member of the Communist Party. He is a citizen of the United States and was sent to the east-coast ports in order to build up sentiment for an International Maritime Federation. He has been a delegate to most of the maritime conventions and is important in the Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, the C. I. O. affiliate.

Rodger McKenna: McKenna is an old-time longshoreman, has no communistic leanings, and did not agree to the Equity Hall program. As soon as this was discovered, he was sidetracked for any advancement. He is working as a longshoreman and is a member of the board of directors that publish the conservative Pacific Coast Longshoremen in opposition to the radical paper, the Voice of the Federation.

Alvin Kullberg: Kullberg was a former I. W. W. organizer. He was affiliated with the Communist leaders in the thirteenth Communist Party district of California. His wife was a teacher in the Workers' School of the Communist Party. He was not given much advancement by the new radical crowd and is now a longshore boss on the water front.

William Christensen: Christensen is a Danish citizen. He is a seaman. He is also a brother-in-law of Herman Mann. He was a member of the board of trustees and is counted as a dependable member of the International Longshoremen's Association and the Communist Party.

J. G. White: White is known to the group as "Dirty Neck." He never has been prominent in the union, but he knows how to take orders and the rank-and-file take care of him.

John Deane Schomaker: Schomaker is a former member of the hospital staff at the Palo Alto Veterans' Hospital. He was discharged for circulating radical literature. He was also a member of the Young Communist League. He had never been a longshoreman or been on the water front before the 1934 strike. He was a student of the Communist Labor School. He is married, and his wife is a sister of the former wife of Herbert Mills, who is now known as Olga von de Boor. Both of these women are the daughters of Max Jublonsky, a San Francisco veteran of the Communist Party. Herbert Mills was at one time a Communist leader in the seamen's union. Schomaker has been arrested a number of times for assault and other charges due to labor agitation. He is now a member of the Communist Party and also a prominent leader in the International Longshoremen's Association.

Robert Boyce: Boyce is an old-time longshore winch driver. He was elected on the board of directors of the International Longshoremen's Association under the Holman regime. He would not subscribe to the Communist leadership and was sidetracked from higher authority.

John P. Olson: Olson is Swedish born, a seaman and a former organizer of Young Communist League. He was candidate for State senator on the Communist Party ticket in 1934. Olson was arrested on several occasions during the 1934 labor difficulties. He has been active in the communistic Workers' School conducted by the Communist Party. He has also been active as an organizer for the radical United Farmers' League, as well as in the New Pioneer movement, active in the recent labor troubles in the Grass Valley, Calif., mining district. He was a picket captain in the 1934 strike and is a very valuable cog in the Bridges organization.

Otto Kleinman: Kleinman is a member of the Communist Party and also of the International Longshoremen's Association. He is on the examining board that looks after new members to see if they are proper material for the Communist Party. He is very close to Harry Bridges.

Ralph Mallen: Mallen was publicity manager during the 1934 strike. He is not a Communist. He was, however, very close to Norma Perrie, who became secretary to Bridges and was under orders of the Communist Party. She was at one time the wife of Arthur Scott, otherwise known as Arthur Kent.

Henry Morrissee: Morrissee was born in Germany and was a member of the strike committee of the 1934 strike. He is a well-known Communist.

Mr. STARNES. Is he a citizen now, Mr. Knowles; or do you know?

Mr. KNOWLES. I do not recall from memory, sir.

John D. Shaw: Shaw has been a candidate for office a number of times on the Communist Party ticket; is a well-known Communist. He never was a longshoreman, but was for a long time a member of the International Longshoremen's Association executive board under Harry Bridges. He is an officer of the ornamental iron workers' union. He is reported to be a member of district bureau, district 13, of the Communist Party. It was this Communist group headed by Harry Bridges and directed by Sam Darcy, then head of the thirteenth Communist district, that started out to wrest control from the conservative longshoremen of the Pacific.

That covers that phase of it.

Mr. NIMMO. Now, Mr. Knowles, after you have reviewed that group, I want to have you emphasize again that, as I understand it, that is the original Equality Hall group which, as an entire group, was responsible for the whole trouble on the Pacific coast.

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right. That is the small nucleus which guides the thread of the whole trouble.

Mr. NIMMO. Do you remember an organization along the water front that was known generally as the "Blue Book"?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir. That was a union preceding the I. L. A., and was taken over by the larger organization, the I. L. A.

Mr. NIMMO. And the riggers and stevedores?

Mr. KNOWLES. The riggers and stevedores preceded that.

Mr. NIMMO. And both of these unions were ultimately disposed of and dissolved, were they not?

Mr. KNOWLES. They were dissolved; that is correct.

Mr. NIMMO. Now, will you indicate how active this Equality Hall group was in connection with the events leading up to the general strike in 1934?

Mr. KNOWLES. With the final granting of the charter to Local 38-79 of the International Longshoremen's Association, this group offered Kullberg as a candidate for president against Lee J. Holman, representing the conservatives.

Holman won the election and with him came Ivan Cox as secretary to the union.

The organization of I. L. A. 38-79 meant that there were two organizations of longshoremen on the water front. The "Blue Book" still had their contract with the shipowners.

Early 1934 found the I. L. A. union and the shipowners at grips with each other.

The Equality Hall group, however, had not been content with the results of the election and commenced immediately a campaign against Mr. Holman. The Waterfront Worker, bulletins from the Marine Workers' Industrial Union, and editions of the Western Worker, official publication of the Communist Party on the Pacific coast, let loose a barrage of hate.

At this time we desire to offer the files for the years 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936, and 1937 of the Western Worker, with the request that these files be marked "Exhibit 6."

On April 19, 1934, it was announced that Lee J. Holman had been permanently suspended from the I. L. A. and that he would not be eligible for reelection to the presidency within a year. Holman was not present at the trial at which the suspension took place, as he was at home suffering from an attack of pneumonia. The charges that were filed against Holman were that he was too conservative and that he did not represent the sentiment of the majority of the unions.

This driving of Lee Holman from the presidency of Local 38-79 placed Harry Bridges and his "Equality" group in the driver's seat.

They immediately started an intensive drive to organize I. L. A. branches in every port of the Pacific coast. One of the first steps taken was to have Norma Perrie appointed as his private secretary. Norma Perrie was at that time a high-ranking member of the Communist Party and could be expected to report in detail concerning matters in the I. L. A. of interest to the Communist Party.

In Communist Party district No. 12 (Washington and Oregon), Harry Jackson, Wesley Randall, S. Sparks, Robert Thompson, Howard Scroggius, James Carroll, Emil Miljuis, and Blackie Campeau were appointed to take charge of the maritime interests of the party. Likewise, in Los Angeles, George Maurer, Dr. J. C. Coleman, Mary Crossman, Joe Simon, Leo Gallagher, and Harold Ashe were assigned to the same function for southern California. Thus Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego were furnished by the Communist Party with committees to effect the whole program of Communist control of marine transportation.

The first organization campaign put on by Bridges, working under the general theory of the N. I. R. A., soon obtained working capital for the new organization, through the per capita tax paid by the

new members of the I. L. A. local. Joseph P. Ryan, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, was so pleased with the results that he appointed Harry Bridges as the Pacific coast organizer.

The first step made to destroy the "Blue Book" union was a demand made by Bridges and backed up by Ryan upon the Central Labor Council of San Francisco to cancel the affiliation of the "Blue Book" unions with the council.

William E. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, was forced to recognize a demand made by one of his national unions, and so the "Blue Book" union was put out of the Central Labor Council and Harry Bridges, Henry Schmidt, John Larsen, John D. Shomaker, William Christensen, Henry Schrimpf, Bjore Halling, Fred Knopp, and John Cronin were appointed as delegates to the Central Labor Council from the new I. L. A. 38-79.

It is important that the committee note that out of these nine delegates, five had been members of the Equity Hall group and that John Larsen and Bjore Halling became members later.

Bridges was also seated as the delegate to the State Federation of Labor convention.

Regardless of the formation of the International Longshoremen's Association Union 38-79, the "Blue Book" union still held a contract with the employers that was not to expire until December 1934. The employers felt that they could not break the contract with any justice to the "Blue Book" union. They stated that they would continue to carry out the contract during its life.

The I. L. A. then began its campaign to break this contract. The I. L. A. showed that under the N. I. R. A. they would receive the new contract at the expiration of the contract with the "Blue Book" union in December 1934. They also served notice to the effect that if the "Blue Book" union did not apply for membership at once, the initiation fee would be raised to \$50 when the I. L. A. were in control and that the "Blue Book" union men would not be employed on the water front.

The weaker of them began to secretly take out the books of the I. L. A. and at the same time carry a book in the old "Blue Book" union. When the "Blue Book" delegates tried to collect fees they were put off for various reasons, and the treasury of the "Blue Book" union began to run low.

These actions on the part of the I. L. A. and counter actions on the part of the "Blue Book" union weakened the authority of the "Blue Book" union officers until they became afraid to take a decided stand and fight the I. L. A. in the open. In the meantime the I. L. A. increased its membership and hundreds of Communists went on the rolls until the I. L. A. had about 3,000 men in the local. Many of these men were strangers on the water front and many of them had never been and were not longshoremen.

The I. L. A. then complained to the local N. I. R. A. board that they were being discriminated against by the "Blue Book" union and could not secure employment unless they joined that union. They stated that the "Blue Book" union was a company union, and that the officers were paid by the employers, and that section 7 (a) of the N. I. R. A. Act was being violated.

George Creel, regional director of N. I. R. A., appointed a committee to hear the complaint of both sides. The committee decided that the "Blue Book" union was not a company union, but that the water front was open to workers regardless of labor-union affiliations. This ruling meant that the employers would be forced to employ I. L. A. men in violation of their contract with the "Blue Book" union.

The first skirmish came on October 11, 1933, when the Matson Navigation Co. discharged four longshoremen because they refused to obey the orders of the pier superintendent. The I. L. A. demanded the immediate reinstatement of these men and, on the refusal of the company, 150 men walked off the docks. The Matson Navigation Co. employed a new force of men and continued operations, but not without disorder.

A strike immediately threatened and the matter was referred to an arbitration board appointed by George Creel, consisting of Judge Max Sloss, Rev. Father Thomas F. Burke, and Henry Grady. After hearing the evidence, the board ordered the Matson Navigation Co. to return the four men to work. Because of this ruling the Matson Navigation Co. gave up its fight, discharged their new men, and reemployed all the strikers.

Mr. NIMMO. And that strike was very short, was it not?

Mr. KNOWLES. Very short; yes.

Mr. NIMMO. However, the Matson Navigation Line capitulated to the demands of the strikers at that time?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right.

Mr. NIMMO. That was in 1933?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIMMO. After winning this strike, do you recall what Bridges next gave his attention to?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

After winning this strike Bridges looked for more worlds to conquer and, on December 17, 1933, at a meeting in the Building Trades Council, gave consideration to calling a coast-wide strike. This strike was to demand \$1 an hour, a 6-hour day, and a 30-hour week, sole union recognition, and control of all hiring halls. The committee should note that this was not done by the "Blue Book" union with which the shipowners had a contract and were operating with, but by the Equality Hall group.

After this meeting a demand was sent to the water-front employers' union to meet with the delegates of the I. L. A. to consider a Pacific-coast contract with them. The employers refused to meet with the I. L. A. and stated that they had no authority to give a coast-wide contract to anyone and that it was a matter for the various ports severally to decide. George Creel, district director for the N. I. R. A., insisted that the employers meet with the I. L. A.

A meeting was finally effected between the leaders of the I. L. A. and the water-front employers' union on March 5, 1934, at which time the I. L. A. renewed their previous demands and in addition made a closed-shop demand for the entire Pacific coast. The employers refused this demand and stated that there was nothing in the N. I. R. A. that required an employer to give a closed-shop agreement to anyone.

On March 7 the I. L. A. sent out a strike call to see if all the locals on the coast would agree to a coast-wide strike on March 23, 1934. The locals voted almost unanimously to call a strike.

Mr. NIMMO. Do you recall a man named Sam Darcy?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir. Sam Darcy was the organizer and head of the thirteenth district of the Communist Party.

Mr. NIMMO. And did he publish something in the Communist magazine to which reference is made in the brief? I will refer you to this volume which is labeled "The Communist."

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir. This is the issue of the Communist of July 1934.

At this time we offer in evidence the Communist Party publication, the Communist, issue of July 1934, volume 13, No. 7, and request that it be entered as exhibit 7.

This exhibit is offered as proof that the Communist Party plotted to break up the conservative longshoremen's union and planned the development of a rank-and-file organization, unification of the whole Pacific coast, a strike of the Pacific coast, and finally a general strike.

Mr. NIMMO. Can you refer the committee to an article upon "The Great West Coast Maritime Strike?"

Mr. KNOWLES. This exhibit contains an article entitled "The Great West Coast Maritime Strike," by Sam Darcy, at that time head of the Communist Party in the State of California.

Mr. NIMMO. And what was that statement or article by Sam Darcy in reference to, and whom was it intended to be addressed to, if you know?

Mr. KNOWLES. It was intended, as I recall, to be addressed to—

Mr. NIMMO. To the general public?

Mr. KNOWLES. No; it is addressed to the party. He was virtually making a report on the west coast maritime situation to the Communist Party.

Mr. NIMMO. At some later time Darcy was in Moscow, was he not?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct. He later appeared in the seventh congress.

Mr. NIMMO. Will you refer to pages 664, 665, and 666 of this publication, the Communist?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; I think the committee will be interested in it.

Mr. NIMMO. Will you point out the significance of it?

Mr. KNOWLES. On page 664 we find:

In order more easily to study the development of this movement [by the Communist Party] we are dividing our subject into four main headings:

1. Problems in developing the movement for struggle;
2. Problems in the calling of the strike;
3. Problems in the conduct of the strike;
4. Perspectives for the outcome of the strike.

On page 665 we find:

At the end of 1932, at the initiative of the militant elements of the waterfront, agitation for the organization of a real worker's union began.

This agitation centered chiefly around the publication of a mimeographed bulletin called "The Waterfront Worker" which had an average paid circulation of about 1,000 to 1,500 copies.

In the group which published the Waterfront Worker were included a minority of Communists, and other militant elements. The guiding line for this group was above all to develop a militant group of workers united with the objective of breaking the "Blue Book" Union and to establish a real union. At times there was criticism that the Waterfront Worker did not take a clearly enough

militant stand on this or that policy. When this criticism was justified, it could in every instance be traced to the desire of the Communist elements in the group not to sacrifice the unity of the militant elements for a clearer formulation in minor questions. In other words, the group felt it was more important to attain the larger objective of developing a united militant group (not limited to Communists alone) than to refuse to make a concession to this or that backward idea amongst the workers.

Mr. NIMMO. Now, that was in July 1934?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIMMO. That publication?

Mr. KNOWLES. July 1934.

Mr. NIMMO. And that was practically coincident with the general strike, was it not, in San Francisco?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right. It was published before the general strike.

On another page:

About the middle of 1933, an initiative group was formed, which included all elements (also some militants from the Waterfront Worker), to establish a regular local of the International Longshoremen's Association. The sentiment for the International Longshoremen's Association rapidly developed. Yet there was some tendency among the Communists at that time to organize competitive Maritime Workers International Union recruiting. The International Longshoremen's Association movement was so overwhelming among the men, however, that it would have been suicide to take the handful of militants away from the general stream of the movement. The party, therefore, took a determined stand against it.

Also:

From the moment of organizing, a struggle began between the militant elements on the one hand who wanted action to: (1) Improve conditions; (2) Destroy the "blue book"; (3) Establish west coast unity of all longshoremen—and the reactionaries, on the other hand, who aimed to organize a typical American Federation of Labor reactionary union. In the course of this fight between the reactionary and militant elements, the militant element succeeded in putting through a proposal to call an early west coast rank-and-file convention.

This convention met in February 1934, and remained in session for about 10 days.

On page 667 we find:

There were also a number of directly political achievements at the convention. These included: (1) The adoption of a resolution against the loading of ships flying the Nazi flag; (2) the adoption of a proposal for a water front federation which was a first step toward united action between longshoremen and other marine crafts, especially the seamen, and for gang committees, port conferences, etc.; (3) unemployment insurance; (4) against arbitration.

The committee's attention is called to the fact that the above quotation shows that the leadership was not alone interested in the development of the unity of the longshoremen of the Pacific coast, but in its first convention proceeded at once to adopt the major thesis of the Communist International against its greatest enemies, namely, nazi-ism and fascism.

Also on page 667 we find:

The San Francisco local had sent a very militant delegation. This delegation was the backbone and leadership of the militant sentiment in the convention.

Mr. NIMMO. This charge which you have presented, and which you have available, would indicate that it is the defined, present program of the Communist Party?

Mr. KNOWLES. Very definitely a Communist Party dictated program, dictated to Bridges.

Mr. NIMMO. What happened to Darcy?

Mr. KNOWLES. Darcy is at present a fugitive from justice from San Francisco, and is at the present time an organizer for the State of Minnesota.

Mr. NIMMO. He has not been extradited from Minnesota?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right.

Mr. NIMMO. Because the Governor of Minnesota has declined to issue a warrant?

Mr. KNOWLES. I could not say that.

The CHAIRMAN. He is wanted in California?

Mr. KNOWLES. Under a felony warrant.

The CHAIRMAN. And Minnesota has never issued an order of extradition?

Mr. KNOWLES. Never even picked him up; he has never been arrested.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been any request from California for his arrest?

Mr. KNOWLES. I believe there has been. On several occasions when he was scheduled to appear at meetings, word was sent back, but he was not arrested.

Mr. NIMMO. I want to call attention, Mr. Knowles, to the month of May 1934, and to the arrival of Edward F. McGrady, Assistant Secretary of Labor, in San Francisco, and in connection with that a statement issued by him at that time. You recall that incident?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; I do.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that?

Mr. KNOWLES. Immediately preceding the general strike.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McGrady went to California?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. NIMMO. After Mr. McGrady had been there and talked with them, did he make a statement in connection with that?

Mr. KNOWLES. He did.

Mr. NIMMO. Do you have a reference to that?

Mr. KNOWLES. There is a reference to that on page 31 of the brief.

The CHAIRMAN. What is this?

Mr. NIMMO. This is the statement of Edward F. McGrady, Assistant Secretary of Labor, in San Francisco, after he had attempted to get a settlement of the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the first strike?

Mr. KNOWLES. This was in May 1934, before the general strike took place. Quoting Assistant Secretary McGrady:

A strong radical element in the ranks of the longshoremen seem to want no strike settlement. I have observed that Communists through direct action and by pleas made in widely circulated Communist newspapers are trying to induce the strikers to remain out despite our efforts to arbitrate. The committee seems to be helpless to do anything with the men who are representing them, or to combat the radical elements in the International Longshoremen's Association unions.

Mr. NIMMO. Will you refer to exhibit No. 7, or to page 686, of the July issue of the Communist magazine, and I will ask you to read the statement which appears on page 686 in connection with Darcy's

article in the Communist, in respect to the general subject matter of this investigation.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir. It says:

This meeting shows the strike at this date has not yet reached the height of its militancy and the movement toward a general strike is possibly too slowly, yet undoubtedly, moving forward.

Mr. NIMMO. Mr. Knowles, you have read that statement; now, in interpreting that statement, that was made prior to the date of the general strike.

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct.

Mr. NIMMO. And the general strike was a comprehensive tie-up of the entire San Francisco area, with the exception of some public utilities?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That statement was made by whom?

Mr. NIMMO. By Sam Darcy, now a fugitive in Minnesota. He wrote this article—an acknowledged Communist—in a Communist magazine. He is the man who went to Moscow.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether he was at Moscow with Victor Ruether and Roy Ruether, and the bunch that went there from Detroit?

Mr. KNOWLES. They attended the seventh congress.

The CHAIRMAN. They were all there at that particular time, and upon their return to the United States then occurred the sit-down strikes with all this lawlessness and disorder.

The reason I am asking that is to connect it up with other testimony along the same line, showing that there was a general plan of strategy adopted, long before there were sit-down strikes.

Mr. NIMMO. That is correct. And along with this statement that Mr. Knowles has just read was the fact that there was this prediction by the Darcy group prior to the general strike. He was building up the idea that they were going to have a general strike at a later time, a strike that was led by Harry Bridges.

Do you recall the progress of that strike, and the action of Governor Merriam, of California, in connection with it?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes. Governor Merriam sent his representative, Mr. A. R. Pidgeon, to Harry Bridges, as chairman of the strike committee and asked him to keep his strikers away from the Belt Line Railroad. This Mr. Bridges emphatically refused to do.

The rioting of July 3 and 5 became so serious that the Governor ordered in the first contingent of the National Guard on July 5. The general strike was thereafter declared.

Mr. NIMMO. This Belt Line Railroad, being a city-owned road, is a road which goes around the piers and yards and takes in the entire water front, delivering cars to all railroads.

That is when the Governor called in the troops?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. NIMMO. Do you recall whether there was a board appointed by President Roosevelt to mediate this maritime strike?

Mr. KNOWLES. There was. Following a request for intervention of the President and the appointment of a Federal board of arbitration to end the strike, the President appointed Archbishop Hanna, of the Catholic Church; Edward McGrady, Assistant Secretary of Labor;

and O. K. Cushing, an eminent lawyer of San Francisco, as an arbitration board to mediate the strike.

Dr. Louis Block, former statistician of the California State Labor Board, was appointed secretary to the arbitration board. He had been pro-labor and was thought considerably in favor of the radical elements that were behind the strike.

Dr. Louis Block has since been appointed to the new Maritime Board in Washington, D. C.—

The attention of the committee is called to the fact that Dr. Block was a member of the professional unit of the Communist Party in San Francisco.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean the man who is now on the Maritime Board was a member of the professional unit of the Communist Party?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct; he was a member at that time.

Mr. NIMMO. That was the Maritime Labor Board.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a Federal agency?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes. The committee is requested to call for designated witnesses from the list appended to this report to prove this fact. He is now most active in Washington, D. C., in the cause for aid to the Spanish Loyalist Government through the American League for Peace and Democracy and the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his full name?

Mr. KNOWLES. Dr. Louis Block.

Mr. STARNES. His position is with the Maritime Labor Board?

The CHAIRMAN. A member of the professional unit of the Communist Party?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he appointed by the President?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; appointed by the President.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he still a member of that Board?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; just recently appointed.

The CHAIRMAN. And still a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KNOWLES. I cannot say as to that. The evidence indicates that he was a member at that time.

Mr. NIMMO. There are some exhibits which unfortunately we have not been able to get here yet, but I would like to refer to a copy of the Western Worker, exhibit No. 6-A, containing a statement which will be found on page 37 of the brief.

Mr. KNOWLES. On July 9, 1934, at the Eagles Hall, San Francisco, Calif., 1,600 men congregated to hear Roy Hudson, a member of the central committee of the Communist Party of the United States, state in part, the following:

We must organize to fight the shipowners, the police, the militia, Russia—he is the mayor of San Francisco—

Roosevelt. They are our enemies as we have learned through our struggles, through our deaths. If we are "reds," then after yesterday, there are many more "reds" on the water front.

The CHAIRMAN. In connection with Roy Hudson, we received evidence some time ago that when an affidavit of one Markham was transmitted to the Department of Labor by Senator Copeland, immediately Harry Bridges left for Washington, and at the same time

Roy Hudson, who was in New York, also went to Washington. Does your investigation show a close connection between Roy Hudson and Harry Bridges, working together?

Mr. KNOWLES. Of course, largely along Communist Party lines.

Mr. NIMMO. And during practically all the time.

Mr. KNOWLES. Hudson more or less dictated the policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The surprising thing is simply this, that here was the Director of Immigration, Mr. Bonham, saying that Bridges had come in his office and had boasted about seeing the central files and then when the affidavit of Markham was sent to the Labor Department immediately thereafter Bridges went to Washington and Roy Hudson went to Washington, and immediately thereafter the witness, Markham, was subjected to a series of attacks; that is what happened.

Mr. NIMMO. Will you refer to a note on page 37, read a statement in the Western Worker under date of July 16, 1934?

The CHAIRMAN. What statement is that?

Mr. NIMMO. That is a statement in the issue of July 16, 1934, of the Western Worker.

The CHAIRMAN. That was before the general strike?

Mr. KNOWLES. No; during the general strike.

In the issue of July 16, 1934, the Western Worker (see exhibit No. 6-A) appeared the following:

The central committee of the Communist Party, has issued an appeal to workers in all parts of the country for immediate action in support of the west coast strike with protests, solidarity action in all ports, and financial assistance—

indicating party support for the strike—

Mr. NIMMO. This man, Roy Hudson, at all times was a leader in the Communist Party, was he not?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right, in charge of maritime affairs, a leader of the central committee.

Mr. NIMMO. Do you know when he was sent to the Pacific coast and what his duties were, from the standpoint of the Communist group?

Mr. KNOWLES. He took over the direction for the Communist Party central committee.

Mr. NIMMO. And that direction was supposedly confined to the labor union situation and the infiltration of Communist activities into that group?

Mr. KNOWLES. Into all of the maritime unions.

Mr. NIMMO. I would like to have you refer to page 38 of the maritime brief, where reference is made to the restaurant in San Francisco, at 501 Baker Street, known as Pierre's Chateau.

Mr. KNOWLES. Pierre's Chateau was operated by one Pierre Margolis. Margolis was the father of a high-ranking member in the Communist Party by the name of Arthur Kent. Kent was known in the party by the name of Arthur Scott.

The CHAIRMAN. Arthur Kent is now in jail in Los Angeles?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. His real name is Margolis?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; Margolis Scott Kent. I think Kent is his legal name.

During this period, Kent was married to Norma Perrie, the secretary of Harry Bridges.

The committee should remember that this Norma Perrie was also a high-ranking member of the Communist Party.

We charge that during the general strike the Communist Party appropriated Pierre's Chateau and used it as a strike headquarters.

That the meetings were held on the second floor in Arthur Kent and Norma Perrie's rooms.

That not only did the Communist Party use the second floor for all their work, but that the Communist Party made Pierre's Chateau feed them.

That Sam Darcy and all leading Communist Party members were daily and continuously at Pierre's Chateau meeting with water front strike leaders.

That Harry Bridges established his headquarters in these rooms for the period of the general strike.

That Harry Bridges had a direct telephone line between his rooms at Pierre's Chateau and the headquarters of the strike committee on the water front.

That Harry Bridges met here with the Buro of the 13th district of the Communist Party and took orders from them.

That one Sam Goodwin (alias Sam Rukin) was a partner of Pierre Margolis and Arthur Kent at Pierre's Chateau during this period and that he, on the request of the party, wrote articles that were published in the Western Worker and in leaflets and pamphlets.

That Sam Goodwin also wrote a speech that Harry Bridges delivered at the San Francisco Civic Auditorium during the general strike.

That Bridges was told that the speech was written under party instructions and that all points therein were given to Bridges by the party and that therefore he would have to deliver the speech as it was under party orders.

That Bridges delivered the speech as ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was Pierre Margolis' Chateau located? Where was that place?

Mr. KNOWLES. At 501 Baker Street, San Francisco, an old 3-story residence made over.

The CHAIRMAN. The Communists used it as headquarters for the direction of the general strike?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And the man whose testimony is reduced to the form of an affidavit—

Mr. KNOWLES. Is one of the owners.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the owners of this establishment.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And at that place they all met and directed the general strike.

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. That speech was written for Harry Bridges by Sam Goodwin?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is Sam Goodwin?

Mr. KNOWLES. He is a partner in the establishment.

The CHAIRMAN. And Sam Goodwin wrote the speech that Harry Bridges delivered?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And Sam Goodwin is a Communist?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; and he also wrote other articles for the Western Worker.

Mr. NIMMO. Mr. Chairman, we also have exhibit No. 8, which is referred to on page 39 of the maritime brief, and particularly with reference to the meeting at the Cupertino Ranch.

Will you refer to that point?

Mr. KNOWLES. Exhibit No. 8 is part of an affidavit in which he states that:

During the general strike I attended a meeting at Cupertino, Calif., at the Beatrice Kincaid Ranch, where a group of leaders of the Communist Party met with Earl Browder, national secretary of the Communist Party, for the purpose of discussing the matter of Communist policy in connection with the general strike.

Mr. NIMMO. Do you recall whether there was a speech at that time?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir; by a man named Edwards.

Kent, in his statement, went on to say:

I frequently met with various leaders out at the beach below Fleishacker's pool. Among others with whom I met there were Darcy, Bridges, Walter Lambert, Schmidt, Schomaker, Schrimpf, "One-eyed" Larson, and Mann, water front section organizer of the Communist Party. I would frequently bring one or two of these men out there in my car and meet the others. These were all meetings of the members of the Communist Party only, and the subject matters of the discussions were always matters in connection with the strategy of the strike.

We charge that at the meeting at the Cupertino ranch one Edwards, a party leader, whom almost no one knows, made a speech and that this Edwards was none other than William Pieck, who had come to this country from Germany as representative of the Comintern to give its directions regarding the handling of the general strike.

That indicates a general contract between the Communist Party, through its central committee, and the Comintern International.

The CHAIRMAN. I may say we have in the record considerable evidence along that line.

There was an investigation conducted in 1920, in New York, by a legislative committee, long before this occurred, dealing with methods used by Communists in France, Germany, and Italy. Those methods were identical with the methods later put into effect in the sit-down strikes in the east and in the general strike situation in the west.

In addition to that, there is in evidence a statement made by Stalin, himself, in which he advises the strategy that was afterwards put into effect.

In addition to that, there is a letter written by Victor Ruether, while in Moscow, to a comrade in Michigan, and there is other documentary evidence that has been introduced showing that this whole thing was planned in advance, and that the Communists have been conducted schools in Detroit, and I presume the same thing has happened on the west coast.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In which the members were trained to take charge of this thing when the moment came?

You may proceed with your statement.

Mr. NIMMO. Will you refer to page 40 of the maritime brief and turn to the statement in reference to preparations for the general strike, and their dealings with the United States Army at the Presidio of San Francisco.

Mr. KNOWLES. That careful preparations for the general strike had been made in advance were evidenced by the fact that the unions had stored up food to be distributed to their members. The strike committee announced several matters of great significance proving that they intended to take over all sections of government. These announcements were as follows:

1. Permits would be issued for the opening of 19 union restaurants scattered at very strategic locations in the city and that deliveries to these restaurants will be permitted. These restaurants would have to serve the total population of San Francisco.

In other words, 19 restaurants were all that were permitted to be opened.

2. That arrangements were being prepared for the establishment of food depots under the control of the unions, and that deliveries would shortly be undertaken to these depots.

3. That arrangements were being made by the strike committee for a special police force to patrol the streets and maintain order.

In other words, they told these restaurants that they would be opened, with deliveries made to these depots, and that they would set up their own police force, taking over a function of the Government.

Mr. NIMMO. Will you also outline the message they delivered to the Government at the Presidio of San Francisco?

Mr. KNOWLES. The strike committee sent a delegation to the United States Government, Presidio of San Francisco. Here they informed the commanding general of the Ninth Corps Area that they would give to the United States Government permits for the operation of Army trucks in the city of San Francisco.

The city of San Francisco and Bay area were paralyzed for a period of approximately 2½ days. The National Guard took a firm stand and put a stop to the embargo on food deliveries; they brought order on the waterfront, and an uprising on the part of the citizens of the bay area brought the general strike to a close.

This did not end the strike, only the general strike. The maritime strike continued.

I now ask you to refer to exhibit No. 9, which purports to be the August 1934 issue of the Communist magazine.

Mr. NIMMO. That bears the label of the Communist Party.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. NIMMO. Will you refer to an article in that magazine which is designated by the title, "In the Midst of Great Historic Battles," referring to page 741, or page 41 of the brief, if you care to do that, and elaborate that point.

Mr. KNOWLES. From page 741 of the magazine, I quote as follows:

What do the present strikes, especially the general strike in San Francisco, show? In the first place, as was pointed out by the recently held meeting of the central committee of the Communist Party, higher forms of class action are being developed by the American proletariat. These higher forms are the mass

character of strikes and the increasing resort to the weapon of the general strike.

Again, on page 745:

In San Francisco the struggle was waged not only between the workers and shipowners but between the workers and the entire capitalist class and the capitalist state.

And on page 748:

The Communist Party played a very important role, first in the development of the maritime strike and in calling the general strike in San Francisco. The Communist Party developed a revolutionary opposition in the International Longshoremen's Association, which soon established its influence over the majority of the workers.

On page 749 we find:

The party will utilize the lessons from these gigantic class battles to carry out the decisions of the thirteenth plenum of the Executive Committee Communist Internationale, namely that "of tightening up the discipline and fighting fitness of every party organization and of every member of the party."

The California district of the party began energetically to execute the policy of concentration on strategic places of decisive industries, and developed revolutionary mass work inside the American Federation of Labor, not in words but in deeds.

The California district has demonstrated in practice that it is possible to involve the American Federation of Labor membership in strike struggles, though their unions are under the control of the reactionary leaders. The California district has shown that the party can establish its ideological leadership over the American Federation of Labor members in spite of their leaders.

The maritime strike has shown that revolutionary leadership in the American Federation of Labor unions is established not through compromise and legalistic illusions but through relentless struggle against the misleaders and the establishment of independent leadership of the economic struggles of the workers.

Mr. NIMMO. Will you just develop that point? Is it the result of your investigations or your conclusion that in all these instances where strikes occurred, and the Communist influence was in control, that the Communist group really wanted to settle anything?

Mr. KNOWLES. No; far from it.

Mr. NIMMO. What was it they wanted?

Mr. KNOWLES. They wanted to continually agitate and keep everything in turmoil, to bring them closer to the point where they thought they might take over.

Mr. STARNES. Is not that a part of their regular tactics?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. They thrive on chaos.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. NIMMO. Do you recall a man by the name of Charles Krumbein, a member of the central committee?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; Charles Krumbein is a member of the central committee of the Communist Party, and both the War Department and the Navy Department have information that Krumbein in 1934, 1935, and 1936 was the organizer under separate commission in the central committee of the Communist Party for agitation work by the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. STARNES. That is, the National Guard and the Regular Army.

Mr. KNOWLES. The Regular Army, the Navy, the National Guard, and the Marine Corps.

Mr. NIMMO. I believe you have a reference to a wire dated July 7, 1934, which he sent to the general marine strike committee in San Francisco.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; it is exhibit 14, on page 43 of the brief, and there you will find the following telegram sent by Charles Krumbein to the general marine strike committee, dated July 7, 1934:

We, 15,000 workers, assembled July 6, 1934, at Madison Square Garden in New York City, send warmest fraternal greetings to all strikers in their heroic struggle for the right to organize, strike, and picket around your justified demands. Your militant struggle is a lesson for all workers on how to fight against the worsening conditions under the New Deal. We pledge ourselves to do all possible to extend the strike to the New York port and to arouse a mighty protest movement against the Fascist terroristic use of the National Guard and the city police on the part of Governor Merriam and Mayor Rossi.

Mr. NIMMO. Now, will you refer to page 52 of the brief, and indicate to the committee the manner in which Bridges then extended his line under the Communist influence.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; that was in connection with firemen, oilers, and water tenders.

One of the most important links in the chain of unions to be taken over by Bridges and his "Equality" group was the Marine Firemen's, Oilers, Watertenders' and Wipers' Union. This union had been for many years an affiliate of the International Seamen's Union.

The Communists used the same method of procedure as always. They first infiltrated radicals into the union and then replaced the old leaders by new men.

John T. McGovern, a union leader who had been business manager of this union for many years, was replaced by one Earl King. King was a Canadian by birth, but eventually became a naturalized citizen of the United States.

King was on familiar terms with all local Communist Party members in San Francisco. He openly supported Communist Party members in the city and State elections. He was a close confidant of Lawrence Ross, who was editor of the Western Worker.

Earl King, Harry Bridges, and Randolph Merriweather, business manager of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, were the three radicals that comprised the most dangerous group on the San Francisco water front.

Their satellites were Claude Britt, the Honolulu representative of the union; Myron Coffin, the Seattle representative; George Boyle, Wayne Beeson, C. Chisterman, Blackie Campeau, Ed. Davis, Joseph W. Dowdy, Jack Dalton, Ben Drysdale, John Ferguson, "Tiny" Ferrin, George Gay, Frank Hawley, and Ben Nelson.

King, Dalton, and Merriweather provided a bunch of sluggers that had no limits in deviltry. Those men were always available to be sent away to do some job of intimidation and violence. A berth on shipboard was always ready for any of these men to make a get-away after they had committed some crime.

This group maintained headquarters in the New Occidental Hotel in San Francisco. The manager of the hotel was James Pope and his son was a confidential clerk to Harry Bridges.

It was this group that threatened and intimidated engineers and nonlicensed personnel who refused to join the union.

There was close cooperation between Marine Firemen, the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, and the Communist Party.

Mr. STARNES. Before you go further, let me say this. In other words, it is not only the employers who have strong-arm squads and

who import killers and thugs and gunmen, but we find these employees doing that?

Mr. KNOWLES. We are leading up to a presentation along that line, if I may continue. In other words, if they could not sell their doctrines to these people, they either liquidated them or purged them or got them away from the scene.

The CHAIRMAN. These three men were the spearhead of that lawless gang; is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right. Earl King is now a resident of San Quentin Prison.

Mr. STARNES. Did you find evidence of the fact that some of these men were imported or brought from out of the State of California?

Mr. KNOWLES. The sluggers, you mean?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, to some degree, in some locations.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you develop your story along that line.

Mr. KNOWLES. I think if you will permit me, I have something on that in this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. NIMMO. I was just going to tie that in, Mr. Chairman. This party, Earl King, whom you mentioned, is now in San Quentin; is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. NIMMO. Will you state the circumstances surrounding the indictment of the four or five defendants with Earl King?

Mr. KNOWLES. Let me say before that that at this time we notify the committee that witnesses from the list appended to this report will be put on the stand to prove the assertions regarding the activities within the Firemen, Oilers, and Watertenders' Union.

On April 24, 1936, indictments were returned against three members by the San Francisco grand jury on the charge of criminal libel.

These were Earl King, secretary of the Marine Firemen, Oilers, Watertenders, and Wipers' Union, and A. M. Murphy, assistant to Harry Lundeborg, secretary of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, and James Neill, alias Walter O'Neill.

We introduce to the committee at this time a clipping from a San Francisco newspaper dated April 29, 1936, entitled, "Three Indicted in Union Murder Conspiracy," and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 16."

We quote from this exhibit:

That the entire *Hunter case* was framed by King, Bridges, et al., in the hope of obtaining newspaper publicity that would discredit Mr. Hunter and the International Seamen's Union was clearly brought out in court and has been made even more evident since the grand-jury investigation.

In September 1936 a more sinister plot came to light, the same Earl King, and E. H. Ramsey, George Wallace, Frank J. Conner, and Ben Sackowitz were indicted by the Alameda County grand jury and held to answer on charges of first-degree murder for the murder of George W. Alberts, chief engineer of the steamship *Point Lobos*.

We introduce at this time clippings from a San Francisco newspaper dated September 12, 1936, and request that they be marked "Exhibit No. 17."

We now quote from a statement made by one of the defendants, Frank J. Conner:

The killing of Alberts was not the work of legitimate union men but of Communists in the ranks of labor. Legitimate union men do not believe in beef squads and don't want them.

The Alberts murder was the work of a handful of Communists who were trying to ruin the Marine Firemen, Oilers, Watertenders, and Wipers' Association, which is one of the finest organizations in the country.

I am not a Communist and I don't want to associate with them. They are not interested in better wages or better conditions for seamen. They are only interested in constant turmoil.

One Communist on a ship will get the whole crew down. I would leave any ship that had more than two of them aboard, because it would mean just continual trouble for everyone during the entire cruise. Even though there are only a few Communists aboard, those who oppose them are likely to get their heads knocked off when they go ashore.

That which has followed since the conviction of these murderers is of equal interest to the committee.

George Alberts was killed, leaving a wife and three small children, in order to terrorize other men who refused to obey the demands of the Communist radical leaders. Since the murder, a so-called "defense committee" has continued to solicit funds to aid these four criminals and provide them with comforts while in prison.

King, while occupying a felon's cell, has been regularly elected as honorary president of the Firemen's, Oilers' and Watertenders' Union. The "red" line of communism is shown in the entire case.

King was a member of the Communist Party, as well as Sackowitz. Ramsey and Murphy took Wallace to George Wolff, a member of the Communist Party, who in turn took them to Lawrence Ross, then editor of the "Western Workers," to arrange for a passport to either Mexico or Russia. Sackowitz, being a member of the party, was gotten out of town. He reported to the Communist Party in New York, where he was last heard from and probably secured through that agency a passport to Russia. The attorney who was hired to defend this group was George Anderson, a ranking member of the Communist Party.

This murder was but one of a series of other murders or attempted murders of licensed or unlicensed personnel. For the benefit of the committee we shall cite a few of them.

At this time we offer in evidence photostatic copy of note sent to strike committee, Marine Workers' Industrial Union, by Carl Lynch, secretary of strike committee, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 18."

In the original, in caps, "HE IS NOT TO BE PERMITTED TO RETURN TO THAT SHIP." is typed in red. It is interesting to note that Captain Silvers did not return to the ship.

The CHAIRMAN. What was that?

Mr. KNOWLES. This is a photostatic copy of a memorandum note written on paper, dated May 23, 1934, 9:30 p. m. It says:

ATTENTION: Strike Committee M. W. I. U.

Captain Silvers, aboard steam schooner *Peter Helmes*, pier 40, goes ashore at night and returns every morning, sometimes before 8 a. m. He is a short heavy-

set man, wearing a grey suit. The masters, mates, and pilots, having declared a strike, HE IS NOT TO BE PERMITTED TO RETURN TO THAT SHIP.

The ship is working two sets of gears. Try to check on scabs.

Your cooperation with our pickets on this matter will be appreciated.

Respectfully,

CARL LYNCH.

Secretary, Strike Committee.

Mr. NIMMO. I ask you whether Captain Silvers ever went back to the ship?

Mr. KNOWLES. Captain Silvers did not return to his ship.

Mr. NIMMO. Will you continue with the other murder?

The CHAIRMAN. What happened to Captain Silvers?

Mr. KNOWLES. I do not know. He is unheard of at the present time. His present whereabouts are unknown, have been unknown from that time on.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, it is now a quarter of twelve and, so that we may have a connected view of this picture so far, will you summarize what this has shown up to this time? I think you can do that, for this morning's hearing, so that we can have a brief, summarized picture.

Mr. NIMMO. You mean you would like to have us summarize what we have presented this morning, up to the present time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; if you do not mind.

Mr. NIMMO. It would be this, substantially, Mr. Chairman: That the Communist Party has infiltrated into this particular activity that we are dealing with now, the maritime unions on the Pacific coast. That away back, as early as 1922, I believe it was, there were other unions functioning on the coast and for many years they had no particular trouble with the shipowners and with the operators.

That when Bridges began his activity and after 1922, I think it was, and continuing right down to the time of the general strike in 1934, this Communist infiltration continued with increasing velocity or movement.

That it finally worked its way completely through the labor unions, and particularly, in our discussion today, the maritime unions on the Pacific coast.

That they were all brought together under this maritime federation of which Bridges at one time was the president. Later on, because of his success with this, he was made a director of the C. I. O. on the Pacific coast, or the director on the Pacific coast.

That the Communist influence has been most directly contacted with and directed in the labor unions through the agency of Bridges' own work and his own activities.

That at heart he is a Communist. That all of his statements and activities, which will be disclosed in this brief, up to the present time, point to a communistic viewpoint, independently of his activities. And then that in subsequent years, as he developed, he reached a Communist state of mind.

That it was not to settle the thing that they were fighting for, but it was to keep on fighting and ultimately bring about such a condition as this general strike in San Francisco, following the maritime strike on the water front in 1934.

We had reached the point when the chairman suggested this summary, of producing a record or at least a part of the record of the murders which followed; of the sinking of the body of one man in

the Bay of San Francisco in cement and chains; of the conviction of some of these men and of their——

The CHAIRMAN. You have not gotten to that yet?

Mr. NIMMO. No.

The CHAIRMAN. I was referring only to what developed this morning. I was interested in the statements that they had formed a committee for the purpose of terrorizing anyone who opposed their wishes.

Was that a part of the Communist strategy?

Mr. NIMMO. Unquestionably, it was. And it grew out of the work of the Equality Hall group, and the other high-powered sluggers and those men that were introduced into the San Francisco group.

Mr. STARNES. There is one thing that I, as a member of the committee, am interested in. That is the question whether or not it is undisputed that Harry Bridges is an alien.

Mr. NIMMO. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. There will be strong evidence, sufficient to convince the open mind, that he is a Communist?

Mr. NIMMO. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Then, tied with that and his Communist activities, you will be able to show that there have been acts of sabotage, terrorism, and crimes involving moral turpitude?

Mr. NIMMO. I think we can connect that up quite completely. But, of course, I think it will take a period of time, because we have witnesses which we will have to produce at the appropriate time. We could not do it here in Washington.

Mr. STARNES. I understand; but you can do that?

Mr. NIMMO. I think without doubt the committee will be satisfied on that point.

The CHAIRMAN. I may say, having read this Labor Department file very carefully, that it has in it all of the evidence in the world that is needed to tie that in; that is right in this file.

Mr. NIMMO. Yes, I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, in addition to what you have. But, just taking the file, the depositions and the affidavits in the file, it ties that in quite completely.

Mr. NIMMO. I think so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STARNES. Will your investigation disclose, or has it disclosed, that this was more of a reign of terror out there, in line with Communist Party action, than it was a legitimate labor union strike, with legitimate labor union demands?

Mr. NIMMO. I do not think there is any doubt about it at all. I want to make the same apology that I did when I first came here. This material, which is exceedingly voluminous, has been thrown into my hands only within the last few days. But I have tried to make an intensive study of it, and I think the development of it is very clear, that, throughout, they intended to bring about this general strike, not for the purpose of emphasizing any labor union demands but to bring about a state of chaos, which is typically communistic. That is all there is to it.

Mr. STARNES. That is what the committee is exceedingly anxious to bring out; because, frankly, I am quite sure that a number of the members of the committee, as well as the vast majority of our people, are interested in and sympathetic with legitimate labor union de-

mands. But when it gets beyond that field and becomes a matter of absolute lawlessness and a reign of terror, directed by the Communist Party, as part of the Communist Party program, then we have an entirely different proposition. And, of course, that is what we are trying to develop.

Mr. NIMMO. I think that has developed. We have attempted, of course, in this very hurried way today—because we were afraid the committee might be jealous of its time—to bring out these highlights. We hope to develop it more fully when the committee gets out west. But we would say this, that it is quite obvious from these investigations that the research committee has made, that the main object—or, if I may put it this way—the first main object of this Communist group was to get rid of the legitimate, conservative, strong labor union leaders, who had been in power for years. And that was precisely what they accomplished, when they ultimately got through. That was to get these men out. This Blue Book Union is no longer, I understand, in existence. If it is, it is not functioning. And that was a union that existed on the water front for many years.

Then, when the International Longshoremen's Association was developed by Bridges, it wiped out these other two unions, the Riggers and Stevedores, I think they called it.

Mr. STARNES. You are going to be able to show that this maritime strike which tied up the American flag on the coast, or drove it, rather, from the Pacific Ocean, was directed by an alien, who was assigned by a group of other aliens, most of whom were active members of the Communist Party?

Mr. NIMMO. I think you have summarized it very well.

The CHAIRMAN. We will recess until 1 o'clock.

(Whereupon a recess was taken until 1 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

(The subcommittee resumed its session at 1:30 p. m.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Knowles, when you read from the brief, please give the page and line, so we will have no trouble in following it.

Mr. NIMMO. Mr. Chairman, I think this morning, at the time of adjournment, we were just going into the murders, or into the series of murders. I think Mr. Knowles might proceed with that part of it.

Mr. KNOWLES. At the conclusion of the testimony this morning, we were at the center of page 56. The first case is that of Otto Blaczensky.

He was deck engineer of the S. S. *Minnesotan*. He was urged to join the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association and refused. On October 22, 1936, while the *Minnesotan* was lying at pier 28, he had his throat cut and his body thrown into the bay. No arrests have ever been made in this case.

The next is the case of William V. McConologue. He was assistant engineer on the S. S. *Gootoneva*. His body was found floating in the bay in November 1936.

The next is the case of Raoul Louis Cherbourg: On August 2, 1936, Cherbourg's body was found in the bay near the San Mateo-Hayward Bridge. His nude body wrapped in chains and wire gave mute evidence of the manner of his death. This man was a friend of Harry Lundeberg's and it was felt that he had important information to reveal to Lundeberg.

We offer at this time the picture of Cherbourg's body and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 19."

(The picture referred to was received in evidence and marked "Knowles Exhibit No. 19, October 24, 1938.")

The CHAIRMAN. They had a chain wrapped around his body. They tied a weight to it, and the body was thrown into the bay.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How did they recover the body?

Mr. KNOWLES. It floated.

The next is the case of Carl Tillman: Carl Tillman, a member of the Seamen's Union and a friend of Cherbourg's, had received a telephone call from him stating that he had some information. A meeting place was arranged for, but the man met his death before the meeting took place. The Seamen's Union offered a reward of \$500 for the arrest and conviction of those who committed this crime, but no arrest has taken place in this case to date.

The next is Frank G. Hussey: He was chief engineer of the S. S. *Shelton* and incurred the displeasure of certain union leaders. His dead body was taken out of the bay in San Pedro, Calif.

The next is Charles Arnold: The assistant engineer of the Dollar Line S. S. *President Polk* while at sea on October 7, 1935, was assaulted by Eugene Paton, now president of the Warehousemen's Union in San Francisco, and by Thomas Sharp. He was attacked in his stateroom.

We desire to introduce at this time a copy of that portion of the log of the steamship *President Polk* dated October 7, 1935, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 20."

(The matter referred to was received in evidence and marked "Knowles Exhibit No. 20, October 24, 1938.")

The CHAIRMAN. This reads—

At 11:48 p. m., October 7. Eugene Paton and Thomas O'Neil Sharp assaulted Charles Arnold, second assistant engineer, while he was asleep in his bunk with an instrument, to wit, a piece of standard galvanized iron pipe 21½ inches by 1½ inches, likely to produce great bodily injury. C. Arnold has a laceration about 1½ inches long in the skin over the bridge of the nose. This wound is jagged and the * * * contused and swollen; the wound extends entirely through the skin but there is apparently no fracture of the nasal bones. Paton and Sharp deserted the ship after committing the offense.

Mr. NIMMO. I think it should be emphasized that the president of the International Longshoremen's Union, working under Bridges—

Mr. KNOWLES (interposing). The president of the International Longshoremen's Union, at San Francisco—

Mr. NIMMO (interposing). Under Bridges.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir. They had two strikes, and he has been dominating the strike of the warehousemen, or the strike that has tied up the warehouses in San Francisco.

Mr. NIMMO. Working under Bridges.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

The next case is that of John Hogan: He was a patrolman of the International Longshoremen's Association, and on or about March 27, 1937, he talked with friends while he was on his way to have a little family party with his wife and child. Hogan never arrived home and has never been heard of since.

Hogan was very much against the Communist element in the International Longshoremen's Association and made no attempt to keep silent on the subject. Because of his outspoken tactics many complaints were made to higher I. L. A. officials.

The next is the case of Robert Hilker: He was deck engineer of the S. S. *Helen Whittier*, which was strike-bound in Honolulu in April 1936. He was forced to leave the ship for fear of foul play. He had opposed the tying up of the vessel. The day he was last seen he told the dock watchman that he was leaving the ship because, "If I sail with that gang, you will be picking me up out of the bay." Three days later his battered body was recovered from the bay.

The next is the case of G. Mott.

He was third engineer of the S. S. *Golden Star*. Mr. Mott had an excellent service record with the American Hawaiian Steamship Co. and was known as a conservative labor man. His body was recovered from the Bay of Kobe Harbor, Japan, April 10, 1936.

The next is the case of K. H. Schwartz: On January 11, 1935, Schwartz was serving as a second assistant engineer on the S. S. *Point Clear* and the crew refused to work the vessel because Mr. Schwartz refused to join the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association.

On June 28, having been transferred to the S. S. *Judith*, Schwartz was assaulted and stabbed by P. F. Flanagan, a member of the crew, while Schwartz was eating a meal.

We request that the committee pay particular attention to the matter of R. L. Cherbourg, as it will be brought up again in another brief.

The Marine Firemen's, Oilers', and Watertenders' and Wipers' Union still hold their membership in the Maritime Federation.

THE MARINE COOKS' ASSOCIATION

The Marine Cooks and Stewards' Association had been for many years an affiliate of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific and the International Seamen's Union. Eugene F. Burke was the secretary of this association.

The Communist Party made sufficient infiltration into the Cooks and Stewards' Union to make Burke take orders from them when he tried to jump over the traces.

In defiance of the rules and laws of the International Seamen's Union he took his organization into the Maritime Federation of the Pacific and obeyed the program that Bridges set up.

When Ivan Hunter wrote to the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, inviting them to come back into the International Seamen's Union, Burke wired the Maritime Federation that his organization backed the stand of the S. U. P. and would not join the International except on the terms that the sailors set up.

This position placed Bridges in command through the Maritime Federation of the Cooks and Stewards and they did their share of strike activities in violation of the various awards that had been signed by both parties.

At the present time the situation is that the Marine Cooks and Stewards' Association has gone over to Harry Lundeborg, and when Sailors' Union of the Pacific goes into the American Federation of Labor it is likely that they will follow the Lundeborg lead.

THE BAY AND RIVER BARGEMEN'S UNION

This union had for its business manager Ted Starr, and although he frequently takes issue with Bridges on matters of policy, it is to be noted that he took his union into the Maritime Federation. Thus the Bay and River men made an added link to the chain controlled by the federation.

THE DOCK CLERKS' UNION

During the life of this union many jurisdictional disputes have taken place between it and the Railroad Clerks.

J. J. Finnegan was formerly business manager and is a conservative.

During the 1934 strike he tried to bring about peace and was one of the delegates that agreed with Joseph Ryan, Mike Casey, Dave Beck, and the citizens' committee to end the strike. Because of this action he was dropped from his position.

Harry Estey became president, and S. F. Bode, George A. White, and H. Stuyvulaer took over this union.

This union also came into the Maritime Federation and organized branches in the several ports of the Pacific coast.

At the present time they have appeared to have broken with Harry Bridges. The new officials in opposition to the Bridges group refused to let him or the Maritime Federation have anything to do with the new contract that they negotiated with the water-front employers, but they are still members of the Maritime Federation and no doubt everything will be done to patch up the present disagreement.

THE FERRYBOATMEN'S UNION

The Ferryboatmen's Union has never been a radical union and its members have been generally old seamen who were employed on the local ferries connecting San Francisco with points on the San Francisco Bay.

Until 1936 they were members of the International Seamen's Union, but in 1936 the charter was suspended because they affiliated with the Maritime Federation. Charles W. Deal was the business manager of this union, and it is to be remembered that he aided Albert Kullberg in circulating the first petition for a charter for a new longshoremen's union that was finally chartered by Joseph C. Ryan, as I. L. A. 38-79.

During the general strike of 1934 Deal called off the men from the local ferries, preventing thousands of commuting residents from getting to San Francisco during the 3-day general tie-up.

When John L. Lewis of the C. I. O. gave Bridges control of the Pacific coast, Deal went along with the C. I. O. and the Bridges control.

Mr. NIMMO. Now, will you take up the question of the Ship Scalers' Union, mentioned on page 61? Suppose you outline Brown's activities in connection with the Ship Scalers' Union.

SHIP SCALERS' UNION

Mr. KNOWLES. Prior to Communist infiltration this union had been a rather humble organization and never got into trouble. The men were satisfied with their jobs and their employment.

Infiltration commenced prior to 1934 and the conservative men began to notice that their authority was being questioned.

On September 23, 1935, the Communists made up their minds to take over the union and brought their "beef squad" to the headquarters of the union at 32 Clay Street.

A serious riot took place in which Vincent Torres was killed and Alva Du Mond, head of the unemployment movement of the Communist Party, was severely stabbed, as was Soren Sorenson, a prominent member of the I. L. A.

George Wolff and Archie Brown, both members of the Communist Party, together with three others, were arrested and charged with murder.

This case was finally dismissed as the police declared it to be just another water-front riot with insufficient evidence.

Archie Brown is an active member of the Communist Party. He has been arrested many times. He was candidate for the State assembly on the Communist Party ticket. He has acted as a personal bodyguard of Harry Bridges.

We point out to the committee at this time that we have mentioned Archie Brown in particular because he is neither a longshoreman nor a ship scaler and he had no business at a meeting at which the riot took place except to help in taking the union away from the conservative membership. He was there purely as a member of the Communist Party to see that the dictates of the Communists were carried out by George Wolff.

I might mention in connection with Archie Brown that the latest information shows that he was employed with the Loyalist forces in Spain.

The Communist Party effected control of the Ship Scalers' Union. George Wolff became president, Pete Garcia, vice president, and Mary Sandoval became secretary.

Pete Garcia was a member of the I. L. A., editor of a radical Mexican newspaper, and member of the Communist Party. He was active in trying to have Paul Scharrenberg dropped out of the I. S. U., the Central Labor Council, and the State Federation of Labor. As Garcia had been active in organizing the I. L. A., he received his reward by being elected vice president of the Ship Scalers' Union.

The most flagrant of all the acts of the Communist Party was the induction of George Wolff into the Marine Union leadership. Wolff has no record as ever having worked along shore in San Francisco in any capacity. He has a gift of speech and some degree of education. He was recruited for the International Longshoremen's Association from a Mission Street "hash house" and his first job was to be placed on the labor relations committee of the International Longshoremen's Association in San Francisco. Wolff next organized the dock stewards and then proceeded to order the slowing up of work and a change in working rules on the dock in violation of the awards.

He then became president of the Ship Scalers' Union, president of the Communist Sports Club, and was active in all Communist gatherings supporting the Communist Party ticket. Wolff has also

been chairman of many reception committees to ranking members of the Communist Party, of which he also is a very high member.

He is now the president of the Alaska Fishermen's Union and is looking for new worlds to conquer.

It is perhaps needless for us to here point out that the Ship Scalers' Union also affiliated with the Maritime Federation when George Wolff became its president.

Mr. NIMMO. It should be emphasized that Brown was not a member of this crew, nor a member of the Longshoremen's Union. He had no part in the work of these men or in the activities at the time the riot occurred.

THE AMERICAN RADIO TELEGRAPHERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. KNOWLES. The American Radio Telegraphers' Association was another of the unions that joined the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. We will not discuss it in this brief, as we intend to present a separate brief on communications and the infiltration of Communists into the handling of communications.

LOCAL 68 OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS

This union had been an American Federation of Labor affiliate, but its charter was taken away when it affiliated with the Maritime Federation of the Pacific.

Peter Isaac is president. Harry Hook, business agent, T. W. Howard, secretary, E. F. Dillon, recording secretary.

Harry Hook is a member of the Communist Party. He was on the 1934 strike committee under Harry Bridges. He is at present an officer in the Maritime Federation and is active in C. I. O. circles.

THE MASTERS, MATES, AND PILOTS' ASSOCIATION

This organization was long affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The San Francisco local was headed, during the 1934 strike, by George Charlot as president, Captain E. V. O'Grady, secretary and business manager, and C. F. May as secretary-treasurer.

O'Grady, the secretary and business manager, practically ran the union. O'Grady was an old-time Communist and was active in organizing the Maritime Federation. O'Grady and Roy Pyle, of the A. R. T. A., worked with Sam Darcy, then the head of the thirteenth Communist district, in electing H. Lundeborg as the first president of the Maritime Federation.

Charges were brought against George Charlot that he had taken photostat copies of certain official communications and he was deposed as president being succeeded by Capt. O. R. Rolstad.

O'Grady became too active in Communist circles and therefore lost his position as business manager of the M. M. and P. He was then appointed as regional director of the Committee for Industrial Organization of Portland, Oreg.

The Masters, Mates, and Pilots' Union have now severed their affiliation with the Maritime Federation. They did not join the C. I. O.

MARINE ENGINEERS' BENEFICIAL ASSOCIATION, LOCAL 197

This local is officered by J. E. O'Brien as president, John Dever and A. Mehle as vice presidents, and Randolph Merriweather as secretary-treasurer and business manager. The officers are figureheads and Merriweather runs the union.

Merriweather was in close harmony with Bridges, Earl King, and other radicals and joined the Maritime Federation.

While Merriweather is not recorded as a Communist, nevertheless, he worked with Communist leaders and with radical leaders and was active in the 1934 and other maritime strikes.

Mr. NIMMO. Now, we would like to present a general outline of the Maritime Federation, beginning on page 65, and continuing on pages 66 and 67.

Mr. KNOWLES. In connection with the general strike?

Mr. NIMMO. Yes. The report on the general strike to the Comintern at Moscow was in what year?

Mr. KNOWLES. That was in 1935.

Mr. NIMMO. If you will refer to page 65, you will find the beginning of the outline of the Maritime Federation.

Mr. KNOWLES. We have now presented to the committee the roster of the unions joining the Maritime Federation. We have tried to give the picture of the Communist thread running back and forth through these unions as their warp and woof. We shall now show to the committee by what means the Federation was accomplished.

In February 1935, Harry Bridges, Henry Schmidt, Henry Schrimpf, and Alvin Kullberg, all members of the "Equality Hall" group, had themselves appointed delegates from I. L. A. 38-79 to a convention to arrange for organizing the Pacific Coast Federation.

This effort was backed by the Communists of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Districts. Bridges appointed himself, Roy Pyle of the A. R. T. A., and Captain Lawberg of the Masters', Mates' and Pilots' Union as a committee on bylaws. In May 1935 at an I. L. A. district convention held in Portland, William Christensen, Emmet Harris, Fred Heiner, Otto Kleinman, John Montacelli, William Owens, John Olson, Henry Schmidt, Henry Schrimpf, John D. Shaw, and Elmer Wheeler were elected delegates to attend a meeting of organization for a maritime federation.

The attention of the committee is directed to the fact that all these men were original "Equality Hall" members and all members of the Communist Party and every move they made was reported to the thirteenth Communist district.

The Federation was finally formed and H. O. Lundeborg of the S. U. P. and S. M. Kelly of the Firemens', Oilers', Watertenders', and Wipers' Union were elected president and secretary respectively. A new paper was arranged for to be named "The Voice of the Federation," with F. Stoddard as editor in chief.

Stoddard was soon succeeded by N. V. O. Larsen, the paper being printed by the Golden Gate Press at 122 Golden Gate Avenue, where many other radical papers were printed.

The next year William Fischer was elected president of the Federation. Fischer had been a member of the Industrial Workers of the World, but was not a Communist. For this reason Henry Schrimpf was elected as a member of the board of trustees and on the editorial board with Barney Mayes. Mayes was then elected editor in chief.

Bridges did not like either Fischer or Mayes and as these two men were quite independent Bridges determined to get them both out.

Barney Mayes resigned under fire in December 1936 and made the following statement to the press:

The real explanation for this unusually vicious attack against me started in the efforts of the Communist Party to crucify me because I have resisted their attempts to dictate the policy of *The Voice of the Federation*. My fight was never based upon any personal consideration, but upon the desire to prevent the same wrecking of unions which is inevitable when the Communist Party becomes dominant in any situation. We are obliged to leave and let the new editor start from scratch.

At the 1938 convention of the Federation, J. W. Engstrom was elected president. The joint executive and editorial committee is A. Virgin, Paul Benson, Harry Hook, John D. Schomaker, R. Merriweather, Carl Tillman, O. Rolstad, P. Kowalski, G. Sanfazan, and R. Fitzgerald.

The committee has now been placed in possession of the facts regarding the history of the organization of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific and also the general strikes of 1934.

We shall proceed now with the events which have taken place since the general strike of 1934.

We believe that the committee, after the examination of the evidence given in the basic brief, both documentary and the testimony of witnesses who have heretofore appeared before it in relation to the Maritime brief, will recognize that the events leading up to the general strike and the general strike itself may be considered as practices in class revolt. This is exactly what the Communist Party called it.

Mr. NIMMO. I do not have the precise reference to the brief, but I would like to have you take up the development and use of the members of the Maritime Federation and the officials of the Longshoremen's Association in interfering and assisting in other strikes with which they had nothing to do. Do you have that before you?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir; that is on page 68. From the general strike the Communists claim to have learned the application of greater strategy for adaptation in the next general strike.

A full report of the general strike was taken to the Comintern and to the Seventh Congress of the Communist International at Moscow, by Sam Darcy, then leader of district 13 of the Communist Party of the United States of America.

From the report given, Communist International set out the principles for the future conduct of a general strike in the United States of America and these in turn were transmitted to the Communist Party of the United States.

The possibility of a break between John L. Lewis and the American Federation of Labor had already commenced to loom on the horizon. The events of 1935 and 1936 were to see this actual development.

Much of the literature of America, especially the magazines, took a definitely leftward trend. The Communist Party seized upon this and used it to great advantage, capturing the sympathies and support of many American writers.

Strike violence occurred throughout the United States and with it came an increasing tempo of action on the part of the Communist Party.

We are certain that the committee prior to its coming to the Pacific coast has already found that these strikes were more or less coordinated in character and showed all the earmarks of the development of class hostility. This was equally true on the Pacific coast.

In their official and affiliated organs, such as the *Daily Worker*, *Western Worker*, the *Voice of Action*, and the *Voice of the Federation*, the Communist Party has admitted its full responsibility for these strikes and has recognized them as practices in class revolt.

As we proceed to review the situation of the maritime industries from the latter part of 1934 to the present date, we desire the committee to follow carefully and make notes of the many instances in which the International Longshoremen's Association of the Pacific coast and the Maritime Federation officiated or took part in strikes that did not have anything to do with the maritime industry, participating in many strikes that were purely political in character.

It is necessary for the committee to notice the reasons given by the Maritime Federation of the Pacific and the International Longshoremen's Association, as to why they took part in these strikes that were not of their own making.

A strong example of one of these strikes that was not connected with the maritime industry was one occurring among lumber workers in the vicinity of Eureka, Calif., in June 1935. Less than 5 percent of the timber workers went out on strike, and when the president of the Pacific coast district of their union came to Eureka and examined the situation, he declared that there was no strike.

Bridges, however, as one of the maritime group sent in over 200 longshoremen to assist the strikers.

It was this group of 200 that carried out the actual violence that was committed in Eureka.

Mr. NIMMO. What I want to get over to the committee is this, as well as I can, that the city of Eureka is about 300 miles north of San Francisco, and the people who were interested in the lumber strike went up there. There was really no strike, because only 5 percent of them went out, but at that juncture, in came Bridges with 200 Communists to take over the town of Eureka.

Mr. KNOWLES. This city of 24,000 inhabitants carries a police force normally of eight police officers. During the rioting and violence the major proportion of the police force was incapacitated by rocks and clubs. The police as a last resort had to use firearms. When the struggle was over the police force had been rendered totally ineffective and Eureka was in the hands of the rioting longshoremen. This condition existed for a period of 24 hours, until the citizenry could be mobilized. The Communist Party has claimed that the Eureka strike is the best illustration that they have had on the Pacific coast of how a minor force can capture a whole city. We request the committee at this time to call the witnesses in the list appended to this report.

It is an interesting commentary that the newspapers of the Pacific coast wrote up the labor dispute in Eureka in detail, but failed to point out the major thesis, namely, that a radical force had come in from outside of the country and captured a city of 24,000 people by terrorism and an attack upon its police forces.

Mr. NIMMO. The next point relates to the strike at Crockett, Calif. Numerous strikes occurred at Crockett.

Mr. KNOWLES. The same types of situations developed in Crockett, Calif., during the warehousemen's strike at the California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation plant in March 1935; the miner's strike in Jackson, Calif., in the same year, and the Salinas, Calif., lettuce strike, occurring in 1936.

These strikes are pointed out to the committee to show the use made by the International Longshoremen's Association and the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, by the radical leader, Harry Bridges (now Pacific coast director of the C. I. O.) as a disintegrating force in California's economic life.

Mr. NIMMO. We should emphasize that, because you can see that these longshoremen were taken in one instance to Crockett, where they have large sugar refineries, and then they went up into the Sierras, to a little town called Jackson, which is a mining town. The third instance was up in the Salinas Valley, in the lettuce strike, a distance of about 200 miles. In each instance, these men had nothing to do with the particular industry that was involved.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, they initiated strikes and helped in them where they were not at all interested in the particular questions that were involved.

Mr. NIMMO. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That fits in with the same strategy that was followed in Michigan where the evidence showed that whenever a strike was called, members of the Communist Party from the outside were brought in to the surrounding areas to reinforce the strikers.

Mr. NIMMO. If the committee desires, we can outline numerous other strikes of that kind, if you think it is essential.

The CHAIRMAN. They used the same strategy in every instance.

Mr. NIMMO. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The strike instances you have mentioned are illustrations of the methods that they have used in the other strikes.

Mr. NIMMO. Yes, sir. Referring to pages 71 and 72 of the brief, we might refer to the fact that upon these various occasions, this sort of action would be freely predicted sometimes 2 months in advance by the Communist organ.

The CHAIRMAN. They knew in advance what would happen.

Mr. NIMMO. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Were these strikes accompanied by loss of life or property?

Mr. KNOWLES. Not always loss of life, but there was economic loss.

Mr. STARNES. And damage to property.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. And injury to persons?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. If not loss of life, there was injury to persons.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLES. At 8 a. m. on July 31, 1934, the longshoremen's strike was declared off and the men returned to work. On the 12th day of October 1934 the Hanna Arbitration Board announced its award. It is to be remembered by the committee that both the International Longshoremen's Association and the shipowners had agreed to abide by this award in full.

On November 16, 1934, a news bulletin given to all San Francisco newspapers announced:

The steamship *President Wilson* sailed Friday afternoon with a large shipment of coconuts still in her hold, due to the persistent refusal of the San Francisco longshoremen to handle it.

This is but one of many similar instances which have occurred since the award was handed down on October 12. Eighteen separate strikes have occurred and two strikes are in progress at the present time. Each strike has been a definite violation of the award. In addition, a deliberate campaign of terrorism and intimidation has been instituted, and numerous cowardly and brutal assaults have been committed. These assaults have been unlawful and reprehensible in every way and they have been carried out to drive from the waterfront many longshoremen entitled to work under the award of the President's board.

At this time we desire to offer a press release dated December 16, 1934, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 21."

December 1934 and early 1935 were merely a repetition of the months of October and November 1934. Innumerable short strikes were the apparent order of the day.

The Equality Hall group under Harry Bridges was entrenching itself in San Francisco and along the whole Pacific coast. The United States Government seemed absolutely powerless to do anything.

Mr. NIMMO. I do not have the page reference, but I want to ask about the job actions. There was a strike which was settled in the maritime strike of 1934. The point is that after the 1934 strike was settled there was what was called an award made. It was insisted that the thing was settled; that they had no further grievances, and would go forward. Notwithstanding that fact, there was a promulgation by Bridges of a definition of job action. They were isolations and ramifications of the general picture, and were not directly connected with the main strike. There were something like 156 of those job actions.

Mr. KNOWLES. That is referred to on pages 87 to 96, indicating there were 156 job actions and stoppages of work.

Mr. NIMMO. You will find there a reference to the definition which was given as to what a job action should consist of.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLES. Harry Bridges' own organ, the *Waterfront Worker*, and the official organ of the Communist Party, the *Western Worker*, carried out a deliberate coordinated attack upon the entire American Federation of Labor leadership and the International Seamen's Union, laying particular emphasis upon Harry Lundeborg of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific.

It is noticed that just about 2 weeks before an action would be taken in the Maritime Federation or in the International Longshoremen's Local 38-79, an article would appear in one of these two papers clamoring for that action to be taken.

After this build-up, Harry Bridges and the others of the Equality Hall group, such as Henry Schrimpf, Henry Schmidt, John Shomaker, or John Shaw would bring in the resolution and it would be passed.

Instead of giving this committee endless quotations from the *Waterfront Worker* or the *Western Worker*, we shall at this time list a number of quotations that may be read by the committee in the files

1A and 1B, and 6A, and 6B. In the Western Worker, we suggest that the following be read:

January 17, 1935, page 1, under the caption "Maritime Workers Industrial Union offers to merge with the International Seamen's Union."

January 31, 1935, page 1, "Radio operators win demands."

February 14, 1935, page 1, "Bridges protests Greyhound busses."

February 21, 1935, page 5, "Resolution of Central Committee Plenum."

March 7, 1935, "7,000 maritime workers out on anti-Nazi strike."

April 4, 1935, page 3, "Bridges makes vicious attack on Carl Scharrenburg."

April 8, 1935, page 1, "Firemen move for coast-wise strike."

April 15, 1935, page 1, "Call for marine workers to go out on July 5 for a 1-day strike boycott."

April 15, 1935, "Marine Council supports Anti-War Congress."

May 9, 1935, page 1, "I. L. A. district meeting opens in Portland."

May 13, 1935, page 1, "U. S. Navy officers aid suppression of Philippine uprising."

May 13, 1935, page 5, "What to do when arrested on deportation proceedings."

May 27, 1935, page 4, "What would you do in the next general strike?"

May 30, 1935, page 1, "Sailors move to kick out Scharrenburg."

May 30, 1935, page 2, "Seaman scab is dumped on way back to vessel."

June 2, 1935, page 1, "Radio operators strike."

We now request the committee to read the following excerpts from the Waterfront Worker, exhibits 1A and 1B, as follows:

Volume 3, No. 9, "Local 38-79 votes to down tools for 30 minutes in protest against 'Carlsruhe.'"

Volume 3, No. 12, "The tankers strike."

Volume 3, No. 14, "The tankers strike."

Volume 3, No. 15, "Join with teamsters in Oakland strike."

Volume 3, No. 17, "Call for May Day parade of 38-79."

Volume 3, No. 18, page 4, "Declare July 5 holiday for Pacific Coast Maritime Federation."

Volume 3, No. 20, page 6, "Warehouse strikes of 38-44."

These excerpts from the Waterfront Worker and the Western Worker will give the committee a clear picture of what transpired during the months involved. It can be clearly seen from them that these two organs constituted the actual press of the Maritime Federation at that time.

By June 1, 1935, the situation on the Pacific coast had become so bad that the president of the Waterfront Employers' Union, Mr. T. G. Plant, was forced to write a letter to Mr. W. J. Lewis, district president of the International Longshoremen's Association. We request that this letter be introduced and marked as "Exhibit No. 22."

We quote from the letter, as follows:

DEAR SIR: The agreement entered into August 7, 1934, between Pacific Coast District 38 of the International Longshoremen's Association and the Waterfront Employers Union of San Francisco to submit all issues in dispute to arbitration by the National Longshoremen's Board, and to be bound by the provisions of the award, constituted a binding agreement between those two parties.

That formal agreement was made pursuant to earlier commitments and pledges both parties had made to the National Longshoremen's Board, which commitments and pledges had resulted in the termination of the prolonged water-front strike on July 31, 1934.

The agreement was entered into by the employers in the sincere hope and belief that it would be observed scrupulously by both parties and that it would restore peace and orderly relationship on the water front.

The agreement of August 7, and the subsequent award of October 12, 1934, both provided for the peaceable adjustment of disputes. Specifically the award required the establishment of a labor relations committee, to be composed of three representatives designated by the employers' association and three representatives designated by your association; that all disputes and grievances arising relating to working conditions would be investigated and adjudicated by that committee. There was a further provision for the appointment of an arbitrator in case the committee should deadlock. In short the award provided the necessary machinery for the return and the maintenance of peaceable and orderly relationship.

The agreement has not been kept by the officers and members of the San Francisco local of your association. In fact, it has been violated willfully, deliberately, and repeatedly.

Strike after strike has occurred, causing severe financial losses to the employers, interruption of steamer schedules, and annoyance and loss to shippers and the traveling public.

Some of the strikes have been caused to secure some new demand, others have been caused to secure a settlement of some alleged grievance, while still others have been in sympathy with other groups of employees. Many of the sympathetic strikes have been in support of demands of employees over whom the water-front employers have had no jurisdiction whatsoever. The most recent and outstanding example of this last class of strikes has been the refusal by members of your association to handle cargo coming from the California Packing Corporation, because of a dispute between that company and the warehousemen's union.

From the date the award was handed down on October 12, 1934, over 150 separate strikes have occurred in San Francisco Bay district. Each strike has been a definite violation of the arbitration award.

The employers have labored diligently and continuously to bring about a better understanding and to restore peace. Their efforts have proven fruitless.

They are convinced that radical and destructive elements dominate the San Francisco local, and that no peace is possible while such an element is in control. The repeated admission by officers of the San Francisco local that the strikes have been in violation of the award, coupled with the defiant threat that the violations will continue, make no other conclusion possible.

It must be apparent to you and to everyone that the employers cannot, with due regard for the public interest and the necessary regard for their own businesses, allow such an intolerable condition to continue any longer.

No relationship can continue to exist unless agreements entered into are scrupulously observed, and unless there is mutual regard for the well-being of each other. To secure this, in a relationship such as we have attempted to set up, responsible leadership and responsible membership must exist in both groups. There is not such a responsible leadership in your San Francisco local, and our experience indicates a completely undisciplined membership.

The employers have no thought in mind of attempting to upset the award, or of discontinuing their dealings with organized labor.

They cannot, however, tolerate longer the conditions which have existed in this port for the past 8 months, and relationship with the San Francisco local of the International Longshoremen's Association cannot continue unless such changes are made as will make a continuance possible.

They call upon you to bring about the necessary change in conditions.

Yours very truly,

T. G. PLANT, *President.*

By means of threats, intimidations, and brutal assaults, all non-union longshoremen were driven from the Pacific coast water fronts. Their places were taken by newly recruited members of the unions, many of whom had not heretofore been employed in this industry. This action was directly in violation of the award.

Any attempts to give men work who were not union men was immediately followed by a stoppage in work on the part of the International Longshoremen's Association. Efficiency dropped over 50 percent. Cost of handling cargo increased proportionately. Personal injury increased over 100 percent, and damage to cargo by longshoremen doubled also.

Strikers were still controlling the water front and cowardly assaults continued to occur.

Harry Bridges probably best described the situation when he said:

To hell with the award. To hell with the Labor Relations Committee. We are running this show now and we are going to tell you guys what to do and make you like it.

On June 22, 1935, occurred the tie-up of the steamship *Point Clear* of the Swayne & Hoyt lines.

On June 27, 1935, the following telegram was sent to Mr. W. J. Lewis, district president of the International Longshoremen's Association, by the Waterfront Employers' Association. We request that it be entered and marked as "Exhibit No. 23." [Reading:]

Since Saturday, June 22, the steamship *Point Clear*, operated by Swayne Hoyt, has been tied up at this port by refusal of longshoremen to pass through picket line established by maritime unions. There is no dispute between the operator of this vessel and any of seafaring employees working aboard her. There are no demands from any union having any dealings with the operator. There is nothing to discuss and apparently nothing to settle; all possible efforts to persuade the longshoremen to go to work have been made through the customary channels. This action of the San Francisco local of the International Longshoremen's Association constituting such a deliberate and outrageous violation of the agreement between that local and the San Francisco employers and culminating as it does a long series of deliberate and outrageous violations, serves again to prove that the officials of the San Francisco local are proceeding on a willful policy of abrogation of the award and are doing everything in their power to provoke and prolong strife. Further dealings with the San Francisco local as it is now constituted are hopeless and useless. The employers again call upon you to remove the radical leadership which is responsible for the situation. They furthermore must advise you that unless immediate steps are taken to return the longshoremen to work on the *Point Clear* the employers will find it necessary to terminate the agreement with the San Francisco local without further notice. The employers feel that their efforts over the last 9 months to make the agreement and effective means of returning peaceable and orderly relationship on the water front have been amply demonstrated and assure you now that the contemplated action will be taken for the sole purpose of securing a responsible body with which relationship can be resumed.

WATERFRONT EMPLOYERS ASSOCIATION OF SAN FRANCISCO,
T. G. PLANT, *President*.

Despite the protest of the Waterfront Employers' Association when it was notified that a strike would be held on July 5, the strike was held and a "bloody Thursday" parade took place. The Western Worker for July 8, 1935, says as follows:

Hardly a winch or a wheel turned on the San Francisco water front today, and thousands upon thousands of marine workers threw their taunts in the face of the shipowners, their agents, the International Longshoremen's Association district officials, and the capitalist press. In spite of all the threats and obstructions thrown in the way of this day of commemoration, 25,000 maritime and other workers marched up Market Street from the Embarcadero—a 2-mile-long living memory to the martyrs of the 1934 maritime strike.

From our national point of view this was a direct affront to the American people. First, because the longshoremen decided to work

on July 4 in order to have the holiday on July 5; and secondly, because the two men in whose honor the parade was held were killed while resisting police officers of the city of San Francisco who found it necessary in the discharge of their duties, in their own protection against an unruly horde of radical rioters, and to bring a semblance of peace out of a riotous chaos to "shoot to kill." One of the two rioters killed was a member of the Communist Party.

By the end of August, the situation had reached such a point that it was necessary for the Waterfront Employers' Association to make an announcement to the public. We offer this announcement and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 24." We quote therefrom as follows:

To the Public:

The longshore and maritime strikes of last year, culminating in the general strike, were terminated by the submission of all controversies to arbitration under Government auspices.

We realize that no arbitration award can entirely satisfy each party. But each party to an award must accept and scrupulously abide by it, or arbitration is futile.

Therefore, Pacific shipowners and water-front employers have determined that—

1. They will not terminate the maritime and longshore labor awards now in effect although the awards impose heavy financial and operating burdens upon them;

Because: These awards were arrived at only after months of painstaking investigation and deliberation by Government arbitration boards and were intended to be, and can be, a basis of permanent settlement, thus stabilizing the industry. The last award was handed down only 3 days ago.

2. They will not agree to any demands by the men for changes in the awards,

Because: Any changes in the awards at this time would to all practical purposes abrogate them before the ink on them is scarcely dry. Abrogation is merely to renew last year's strike, and is an attack on the awards themselves. The awards themselves provide machinery for the arbitration of disputes arising under them.

3. They will insist upon strict and honest observance of the awards by all contracting parties,

Because: Any strike or stoppage of work for any reason whatsoever is a violation of these awards. Sanctity of labor awards is essential to industrial peace.

This statement is made that the public may know the position of the employers. They are determined that they will not be responsible for a renewal of last summer's strikes.

PACIFIC SHIPOWNERS AND WATER-FRONT EMPLOYERS.

Dated AUGUST 26, 1935.

At various times in 1935, the Secretary of Labor, Miss Perkins, had been appealed to, not only by the Water-front Employers' Association, but also by many service bodies and individuals on the Pacific coast.

On November 29, Warren B. Francis, Times Staff correspondent, at Washington, D. C., was granted an interview by Miss Perkins on the subject of the maritime industry on the Pacific coast.

The report of Mr. Francis' interview was published in the newspapers of the United States.

We quote therefrom:

Refusal of maritime unions on the Pacific coast to observe arbitrator's rulings was tacitly approved today by Secretary of Labor Perkins as a new federation mediation board prepared to step into the muddled Gulf of Mexico shipping situation.

Announcing that both employers and unions have promised to cooperate in settling the Gulf controversy, Miss Perkins, in effect, washed her hands of the Pacific coast troubles and gave the Justice Department a free hand in initiating

court action against the striking groups. Simultaneously she conceded that the Federal Government is virtually powerless to enforce decisions of federally appointed arbitrators or compel unions to carry out terms of contracts negotiated under Federal auspices.

The Secretary's views were disclosed in response to a series of questions about what steps Government authorities propose to take to effect the release of several vessels tied up at Pacific coast ports in connection with the Gulf controversy.

"The only action that can be taken to enforce the decision of an arbitrator should be taken by those responsible for the actions of their members," Miss Perkins said, in replying to an inquiry as to whether the Government is contemplating any attempts to counteract the defiant attitude of maritime unions on the coast. Justifying the Government's failure to take a more aggressive stand, Miss Perkins termed the Pacific coast situation "very peculiar." "It is very hard to hold anyone responsible." She expressed a hope, however, that "more rational heads will prevail."

Discussing the Pacific coast situation, Miss Perkins compared the refusal of the unions to carry out contract obligations with the refusal of members of a private club to agree with policies and decisions of the board of directors. She declared that the defiant groups as "free American citizens" are entitled to dissent, and commented "that is the difference between a democratic country and an autocracy."

The new mediation board named Saturday to attempt a settlement of the Gulf shipping troubles will not take a direct hand in the Pacific coast controversies, Miss Perkins said, although it is expected that the situation at Los Angeles will be improved as a result of Federal intervention in the Gulf situation.

Refusing to state whether she has received any definite assurance that strikers will return to work at Los Angeles Harbor, the Secretary based her optimism on the fact that "if the Gulf situation is settled the cargoes will no longer be hot," and maritime unions will have no further reason to refuse to work ships coming from Gulf ports.

The Labor Department has not attempted to prevent the Justice Department from initiating either civil or criminal action against union leaders charged with conspiracy to violate the antitrust laws—

Miss Perkins said—

the three commissioners of conciliation appointed to supervise negotiations between shipping companies and unions in the Gulf area expect to assemble for the first time Wednesday.

The year 1936 started out with sabotage. On the night of January 1 the crew's dining room on the steamship *Point Clear* had its tables and chairs chopped, dishes and coffee urns smashed with a fire ax.

The most significant action in January, however, was the desertion of the crew on the steamship *Pennsylvania* as it lay at its dock at pier 35 in San Francisco on January 4. On the night of January 3 a crew delegation presented Mr. Hoskier with written demands signed by 33 members of the deck and engine-room crew for west coast articles and pay. The delegates explained that the crew had no quarrel with the Panama Pacific Lines, but were sore at east coast union officials for renewing agreements without getting the same wages and conditions as the west coast sailors enjoyed. The next morning 18 members of the engine crew packed their bags and rushed off the ship. They were later joined by members of the deck crew and stewards departments.

In order to back up this desertion the International Longshoremen's Association, Local 38-99, passed the following resolution:

Refusing to work any ship from the east coast that is manned by men who have replaced the crews taking action in efforts to gain the equivalent of the wages and conditions obtained on the Pacific coast; and be it further

Resolved, That we go on record as refusing to work any ship from the East if said ship is loaded by eastern longshoremen who have replaced longshore gangs which refused to work, in support of eastern men taking action in east-coast ports.

It is to be noted by the committee that this resolution was introduced and read by Harry Bridges.

Mr. NIMMO. In order to demonstrate how the Communist Party has been able to play upon and inflame the emotions of their own followers, I want to call attention to the request which was made by the maritime workers that they observe the 5th of July as a holiday instead of the 4th of July.

Mr. KNOWLES. The request was that the employee should continue work on July 4, which was a national holiday, and stop work on July 5 in order that they might hold memorial services for two men who were killed during the July 1934 strikes in San Francisco.

Mr. NIMMO. July 5 was the date on which they were killed.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIMMO. The point is that instead of observing a patriotic holiday on July 4, they wanted to observe July 5 by holding memorial services for party members who were killed.

Mr. Chairman, one point is referred to here in connection with the difficulties that we have had in the West with the Secretary of Labor, or the Department of Labor, and I think it might be well, if you are willing to listen to it, to have read an editorial by Warren B. Francis, in the Los Angeles Times, he being the Washington correspondent of the Los Angeles Times. It appears on page 80 of the brief.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the substance of the editorial?

Mr. KNOWLES. It has to do with the attitude of the Department of Labor in connection with strikes in general on the west coast. It is contained in the brief.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, it will appear in the record.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In that connection, let me ask you if you have presented to the Department of Labor considerable proof with reference to Harry Bridges?

Mr. KNOWLES. We have.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been quite a bit of correspondence between you and the Department of Labor?

Mr. KNOWLES. Mostly one way.

The CHAIRMAN. There were certain individuals, W. W. Brown, legal adviser; Thomas Finnucane, a member of the Board of Review; and Joseph Savaretti, chief examiner, in the Department of Labor.

Mr. KNOWLES. They were in the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. They wrote a memorandum concerning a protest that was made?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Part of this memorandum, which was marked "confidential," was published in the Pacific Weekly?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The memorandum shows on its face that it is supposed to be confidential. In this memorandum they state this among other things:

Mr. Knowles professes to regard this case as proving the inclination of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to "coddle" Communists. He apparently considers that these aliens accused of communistic activities and held for investigation should be treated with the utmost severity, and that complaints made by them or on their behalf should be ignored. This is not the policy of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which endeavors to furnish as little justification as possible, for representations that these deportees are political martyrs.

Now, what is that publication?

Mr. KNOWLES. The Pacific Weekly was a radical publication, published more or less for the intelligentsia, at Carmel, Calif., which has long been a hotbed of the intelligentsia of communism.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how a portion of that report got into that newspaper?

Mr. KNOWLES. Mr. Chairman, that is more or less covered in the brief that I have covering aliens, which I will present at a later date; but it ties in very closely with this.

The CHAIRMAN. What I wanted to do was to bring out from you the fact that your committee tendered to the Department of Labor all of this testimony. Is not that a fact?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir; virtually all of it.

The CHAIRMAN. And these gentlemen were in charge of sifting this, were they not?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir; reviewing it.

The CHAIRMAN. And they said that any answer that would be made to him would be only to prolong the useless correspondence?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a copy of it?

Mr. KNOWLES. I have a copy of it. I first got it and read it to the press.

The CHAIRMAN. Although it is marked——

Mr. KNOWLES. Marked "Confidential," and revealed the informant in the case, which is a breach of confidence.

The CHAIRMAN. The chief counsel for the C. I. O. is the attorney for Harry Bridges?

Mr. KNOWLES. He is one of the group: yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that will follow later.

Mr. NIMMO. Mr. Knowles, there occurred the arrest of eight workers in the neighborhood of Modesto, Calif., shortly after that time—about 1936, was it not, or was that in 1937?

Mr. KNOWLES. I am not sure.

Mr. NIMMO. Do you recall the circumstance that there was a conviction of these men?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIMMO. They were charged with a dynamite plot to blow up a plant at Modesto?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right.

Mr. NIMMO. They were convicted, were they not?

Mr. KNOWLES. They were convicted.

Mr. NIMMO. And later their cases were taken to the appellate court, either the district court of appeals or the Supreme Court of California, and they remained there for the usual time of cases on appeal?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct.

Mr. NIMMO. During that time can you refer to the statements made in the Western Worker and the Waterfront Worker, advocating a mass pressure strike to intimidate the courts?

Mr. KNOWLES. For 2 months the Communist Party, through its organs, the Western Worker and Waterfront Worker, had been advocating a mass pressure strike to intimidate the courts in order to force the Appellate Court of California to liberate eight workers convicted of a dynamite plot at Modesto, Calif. Harry Bridges finally forced the longshoremen to pass the following resolution which curiously enough was passed on January 15, the day set for the return from the appellate court of its hearing in the case. We quote the resolution:

Resolved, That all workers associated with the maritime industry on the Pacific coast go on record to stop work for 1 hour, the hour and date to be set by the Modesto Defense Committee, during the course of their appeal, as a mass protest against this vicious frame-up and all future frame-ups of all brothers and members of the working class; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution shall be introduced to all district councils of the Maritime Federation on the Pacific coast and to all central labor councils of all seaports on the Pacific coast, asking that such member organizations of these central labor councils who are directly connected with work on the water front also observe the 1 hour stoppage of work.

This stoppage of work was general on the Pacific coast, in direct violation of the contractual obligations of the unions.

Mr. NIMMO. Do you have a reference to the two men who were arrested who were Bridges' henchmen, and both of whom were his bodyguards?

Mr. KNOWLES. One was Alphonse Beyle, and the other was Brazelton, who has since passed away, and who were both, in the past, bodyguards of Harry Bridges.

Mr. NIMMO. They have been bodyguards?

Mr. KNOWLES. They had been bodyguards.

Mr. NIMMO. And one of them was convicted, was he not?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; Alphonse Beyle was convicted.

Mr. NIMMO. Will you refer to the copy of the Western Worker in which certain headlines were published on January 27, 1936?

Mr. KNOWLES. On Monday, January 27, 1936, the Western Worker published in large headlines, "Preparing to loose terror and violence, official statement issued by the Maritime Federation of the Pacific Coast." Under this caption occurred the very famous statement that was later wired to President Roosevelt by Harry Bridges, which was as follows:

Unless the United States Government intervenes there will be launched on the Pacific coast within a month a struggle which will inevitably achieve the proportions of civil war.

We desire to point out to the committee at this time that there could have been no civil war unless Harry Bridges, and the Maritime Federation behind him, started it, and that, therefore, this tele-

gram to the President was a direct threat on the part of the persons who sent it. There is no record to date of Mr. Roosevelt ever having rebuked the senders of this telegram.

Mr. NIMMO. The particular significance of that, as I see it, is the fact that the Western Worker on January 27, 1936, published a story under a headline, "Preparing to loose terror and violence," an official statement issued by the Maritime Federation of the Pacific Coast, and then that was followed up within a few days by this statement to the President, over Bridges' signature, which shows the connection between the two—that is, between the Communist Party organ and Bridges—and the united desire to bring about this state of terror on the Pacific coast.

Mr. STARNES. And it is intended to show, further, that it was not the result of legitimate labor union demands, but that it was a deliberate plan of Bridges and other aliens to start this struggle?

Mr. NIMMO. And he being a Communist himself.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Knowles.

Mr. KNOWLES. Always ahead of Mr. Bridges, and preparing the way for the next thing that he intended to do in the Maritime Federation, the Western Worker on January 30, 1936, carried an editorial entitled "Maintain Unity of the Seamen." This editorial advocated that a fight be put up for the Pacific coast locals of the I. S. U. to remain in the parent organization. We quote in part:

The sailors, the marine firemen, and the marine cooks and stewards must fight to remain a part of the I. S. U., and arouse such a storm of protest in every port and throughout the entire labor movements, that the Olanders and Scharrenbergs will not be able to carry through their splitting action.

Bridges seized upon the revocation of the sailor's charter by the I. S. U. to discredit the leader of the sailors, Harry Lundeborg. Anonymous bulletins and a whispering campaign appeared on the San Francisco waterfront advocating the recall of the newly elected secretary-treasurer of the S. U. P.

The month of February was marked by a strategic retreat on the part of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. It was struggling desperately over the situation existing between the Sailors' Union of the Pacific and the International Seamen's Union and was attempting to bring about unity in all the ports.

On March 2, the sailors on board the steamship *California* announced a sit-down strike just a few minutes before sailing time, that is, they refused to work but remained aboard ship. The firemen elected to support the sailors. The cooks and stewards notified the captain that they would feed the passengers aboard while in port. They did not say whether they would work if the ship was taken to sea. At noon on March 4, the United States district attorney, Pierson M. Hall, announced that he was planning to issue a mutiny complaint against the strike leaders and possibly the entire crew of the steamship *California*. As a result, the following day the crews sailed the ship.

Decisions in the Federal court have clearly established the fact that mutiny or conspiracy to mutiny can be committed in port, but it is interesting to note that Secretary Perkins exerted every effort to quash the mutiny charges against the striking members of the steamship *California*, when Secretary of Commerce Roper urged the

prosecution of the case. Secretary Perkins maintained that the men were merely on strike and should not be prosecuted on a criminal charge.

March saw little change in the maritime situation on the Pacific coast. The rapid-fire campaign of longshoremen to win coastwise standardized loads by the job action route quickly slowed down with only small results.

The end of March 1936, marked the turning point in the history of the activities of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. It was the end of a year of job action and stoppage of work on any kind of suitable excuse.

In order that the committee may have the complete picture, we shall now give the list of all the ships on which job action or short strikes occurred, together with the reasons given by the strikers for their actions:

1. April 12-April 12: Steamship *Cuzco*, crew trouble at San Pedro account stewards.

2. May 8-May 10: Steamship *Golden Peak* at San Pedro, demanding discharge Filipinos, tied up 2 days.

3. May 15-May 18: Steamship *Willsolo*, crew struck on account non-union quartermaster; 3 days.

4. May 20-May 20: Steamship *Makua*, at Iilo, crew refused connect oil hose. Unions cabled; released same day.

5. May 21-June 4: Steamship *Iowan*, at Tacoma, Filipino deck crew; 14 days.

6. May 23-May 23: Steamship *Manukai*, Firemen's Union insisted loyal employee leave ship.

7. May 29-May 29: Steamship *Everett*, Powell River, B. C., firemen refused furnish steam. Engineers furnished steam; tied up a few hours.

8. June 3-June 3: Steamship *Manulai* crew refused connect oil hose at Point Wells; tied up a few hours.

9. June 11-June 11: Steamship *Maliko*, deck crew refused work on account overtime; tied up few hours.

10. June 13-June 13: Steamship *Pt. Palmas*, dispute over overtime; tied up few hours.

11. June 24-June 24: Steamship *Golden Star*, on account loyal employees at San Pedro; few hours.

12. June 29-October 3: Steamship *Pt. Clear*, San Francisco; struck ship account British Columbia cargo; 97 days.

13. July 3-July 3: Steamship *Dakotan*, San Francisco; crew demanded discharge 2 firemen; few hours.

14. July 10-July 10: Steamship *Pt. Sur*, crew struck; dissatisfied with quarters; few hours.

15. July 12-July 12: Steamship *Pt. Caleta* crew refused to sign one-way articles; few hours.

16. July 16-July 16: Steamship *Timberrush* crew on east articles, demanded west coast agreement; few hours' delay.

17. July 16-July 17: Motorship *Willmoto*, at San Pedro; crew struck, no agreements; 1 day.

18. July 19-September 30: Steamship *Shelton*, at Vancouver; crew deserted; 73 days.

19. July 19-September 30: Steamship *Golden State*, at Vancouver; crew deserted; 73 days.

20. July 19-September 30: Steamship *West Mahurah*, at Vancouver; crew deserted; 73 days.

21. July 19-September 30: Steamship *Point Ancha*, at Vancouver; crew deserted; 73 days.

22. July 29-July 29: Steamship *Kentuckian*, crew struck account demanded discharge of cook; released same day.

23. July 27-August 10: Steamship *Peter Kerr*, San Pedro, tied up account Chinese cooks in crew; 14 days.

24. August 1-August 1: Steamship *Pt. Reyes*, crew struck on account one-way articles; released same day.

25. August 2-August 2: Steamship *Pt. Arena*, crew refused to take ship to British Columbia; tied up few hours.
26. August 3-October 13: Steamship *Iowan*, San Francisco, Filipino deck crew; 41 days.
27. August 7-October 9: Steamship *Manukai*, Oakland, Filipino deck crew; 61 days.
28. August 9-August 11: Steamship *Calmar*, no engineers agreement; released by engineers and again tied up by radio operators; 3 days.
29. August 9-August 11: Steamship *Losmar*, no engineers' agreement; released by engineers and again tied up by radio operators; 3 days.
30. August 9-August 11: Steamship *Vernard*; no engineers' agreement; released by engineers and again tied up by radio operators; 3 days.
31. August 14-August 14: Steamship *Ercott* at Vancouver; crew deserted; released after few hours.
32. August 15-August 15: Steamship *Illinois* at Portland; firemen refused to sign on as combination-man. Signed on pending decision of Labor Relations Board; few hours' delay.
33. August 15-September 5: Steamship *Tacoma* at Oakland; Chinese stewards; 21 days.
34. August 19-August 19: Steamship *Golden Cloud*, deck crew account hiring from dock; held few hours.
35. August 22-August 22: Steamship *President Jefferson*, Seattle; deck crew account overtime; few hours.
36. August 27-August 29: Steamship *Golden Hind*, unlicensed crew struck account Filipino stewards; 2 days.
37. September 3-September 4: Steamship *Golden Hind*, deck crew refused paint overside; 1 day.
38. September 4-September 6: Steamship *President Pierce*, unlicensed crew demanded discharge steward; 2 days.
39. September 5-September 6: Steamship *President Coolidge*, walked off in sympathy, firemen declaring poor ventilation in quarters; 1 day.
40. September 8-September 8: Steamship *Golden Bear*, crew refused sign articles to Seattle unless guaranteed passage back; few hours' delay.
41. September 9-September 9: Steamship *Wiltzipo*, Wilmington, Filipino deck crew; few hours.
42. September 12-September 13: Steamship *Texan*; San Francisco; crew's quarters unsatisfactory; 1 day.
43. September 16-September 17: Steamship *Pt. Lobos*, crew struck ship; crew quarters unsatisfactory; 1 day.
44. September 17-November 1: Steamship *Chiriqui* at San Pedro; radio operators; company discontinued its Pacific coast service, laying up the *Talmanca* also during this period; 45 days.
45. September 17-September 17: Steamship *Pt. Ancha*, Seattle, refused to sign on for British Columbia; few hours.
46. September 19-September 19: Steamship *New York*, Portland, Chinese stewards; few hours.
47. September 24-September 24: Steamship *Manulani*, crew struck in sympathy with longshoremen; few hours.
48. October 4-October 4: Steamship *Lake Francis*, walked out on account *Fort Sutter* putting hot cargo on dock; few hours.
49. October 4-October 4: Steamship *Hamlin F. McCormick*, walked out account *Fort Sutter* putting hot cargo on dock; few hours.
50. October 4-October 4: Steamship *West Shipper*, walked out account *Fort Sutter* putting hot cargo on dock; few hours.
51. October 9-October 12: Steamship *Chetopa*, Portland; no radio; 3 days.
52. October 9-October 12: Steamship *Pt. Culceta*, San Francisco; crew demanded rider in articles guaranteeing transportation back to San Francisco; signed articles with rider; 3 days.
53. October 10-October 11: Steamship *De facto*, San Pedro, engineers no agreement; 1 day.
54. October 16-October 19: Steamship *General M. H. Sherman*, San Pedro, alleged "hot" oil; 4 days.
55. October 16-October 19: Steamship *Pt. Ancha*, demanded rider in articles guaranteeing transportation back to San Francisco in case of strike in Gulf; 3 days.
56. October 18-October 18: Steamship *President Pierce*, demanded cash overtime; released same day.

57. October 18-October 18: Steamship *President Cleveland*, demanded cash overtime; released same day.
58. October 18-October 22: Steamship *Admiral Scam*, Oakland, demanded cash overtime; 4 days.
59. October 22-October 23: Steamship *Timberrush*, Portland, crew refused to sail with pilot; 1 day.
60. October 23-October 23: Steamship *Pt. Judith* furnished crew with understanding will not go to British Columbia; released same day.
61. October 24-October 26: Steamship *Nevadan* account revoking dock pass of patrolman; 2 days.
62. October 24-October 26: Steamship *Nebraskan* account revoking dock pass of patrolman; 2 days.
63. October 24-October 26: Steamship *Golden Tide*, account revoking dock pass of patrolman; 2 days.
64. October 25-October 26: Motorship *Willmote*, account revoking dock pass of patrolman; 1 day.
65. October 26-October 28: Steamship *Charles L. Wheeler*, tied up at San Pedro account crew demanding 6-hour day in port and \$1 overtime; 2 days.
66. October 26-October 28: Steamship *H. F. McCormick*, tied up at San Pedro account crew demanding 6-hour day in port and \$1 overtime; 2 days.
67. October 28-October 28: Steamship *Golden Harvest*, crew refused to sign articles; released same day.
68. October 28-October 30: Steamship *Golden Harvest*, demanded optional overtime be paid in cash; 2 days.
69. October 28-November 2: Steamship *Jefferson Myers*, crew refused to sign articles unless rider be put on guaranteeing transportation, wages, and subsistence back to Portland in case of strike on east coast; 5 days.
70. November 2-November 29: Steamship *Katrina Luckenbach* at San Pedro, longshoremen refused to work Gulf cargo; 27 days.
71. November 4-November 8: Steamship *President Harrison* tied up at San Pedro, unlicensed crew demand discharge of chief steward; 4 days.
72. November 7-December 9: Steamship *Pt. Montara* at San Pedro, longshoremen; Gulf cargo; 32 days.
73. November 7-November 12: Steamship *Pt. Lobos* at New Orleans, unable to get crew from unions; Gulf cargo; 5 days.
74. November 8-December 22: Steamship *Chetopa* tied up at Galveston, Tex., crew refused to move ship. Gulf cargo; moved to Houston by pilot and officers, and again tied up, unable to get crew from unions; 44 days.
75. November 11-November 29: Steamship *Matthew Luckenbach* at San Pedro; Gulf cargo; 18 days.
76. November 12-November 13: Motorship *Missourian*, San Francisco, unlicensed engineroom crew demand discharge of two electricians; released 9:15 a. m., November 13; 1 day.
77. November 12-November 21: Steamship *Plow City*, San Francisco, unlicensed deck crew demand rider in articles guaranteeing subsistence and return transportation in case of strike on east coast; 9 days.
78. November 13-November 21: Steamship *Sage Brush*, San Francisco, east coast ship, Shepard Line; certain new crew members demand return transportation in case of strike; 8 days.
79. November 15-November 21: Steamship *President Taft* at San Francisco; crew demand rider in articles; 6 days.
80. November 19-November 24: Steamship *Pomona*, at Longview, Wash., crew demand rider in articles; 5 days.
81. November 19-December 9: Steamship *Pt. Palmas*, at San Pedro, Gulf cargo; 18 days.
82. November 20-November 29: Steamship *Pacific* at Alameda, no agreement with Masters, Mates, and Pilots, Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, and American Radio Telegraphists Association; 9 days.
83. November 21-December 24: Steamship *Diamond Head* at Oakland, unlicensed deck crew refused to clean tanks; 33 days.
84. November 26-November 29: Steamship *Sutherland* at San Francisco; crew demand discharge of second officer; 3 days.
85. November 30-November 30: Steamship *Texan* at San Francisco, 9:30 a. m., unlicensed engine room crew struck, objected to change in rating of water-tenders, ship picketed; longshoremen walked off for short time; released at noon same day.

86. November 30-December 21: Steamship *Buffalo Bridge* at Houston, Tex.; crew refused to move ship; alleged hot cargo; no longshoremen involved in loading; 21 days.
87. November 30-December 9: Steamship *Pt. Lobos* at San Pedro; alleged hot cargo; 9 days.
88. November 30-December 3: Steamship *Pt. Reyes* at Alameda; crew demand cash payment for transportation; 3 days.
89. November 30-December 9: Steamship *Pt. Gorda* at San Pedro; Gulf cargo. Sailed for San Francisco December 8; arrived San Francisco December 9; released; 9 days.
90. November 30-December 9: Steamship *Pt. Arena* at San Pedro; Gulf cargo; 9 days.
91. December 3-December 9: Steamship *Katrina Luckenbach*, San Francisco; again tied up; Gulf cargo; 6 days.
92. December 3-December 9: Steamship *Mathew Luckenbach* at San Pedro; again tied up; Gulf cargo; 6 days.
93. December 3-December 9: Steamship *Jacob Luckenbach* at San Pedro; again tied up; Gulf cargo; 6 days.
94. December 5-December 6: Steamship *Columbian* at Portland, longshoremen demand cut down loads; 1 day.
95. December 5-December 6: Steamship *American* at Portland; longshoremen demand cut down loads; 1 day.
96. December 6-December 7: Steamship *Maliko* at Seattle; crew refused to clean tanks; 1 day.
97. December 7-December 7: Steamship *Forbes Hauptman* at San Francisco; unlicensed engine room crew struck on account of loading Standard Oil products; released in about 2 hours.
98. December 8-December 9: Steamship *Florence Luckenbach* at San Pedro; Gulf cargo; 1 day.
99. December 9-December 10: Steamship *Pt. Gorda* at San Francisco; Gulf cargo; 1 day.
100. December 9-December 11: Steamship *Wildwood* at San Pedro, Shepard Line; steward discharged (seamen demanded); 2 days.
101. December 10-December 10: Steamship *Birmingham City* at San Francisco; account Marine Engineer's Beneficial Association; no agreement; few hours.
102. December 10: Steamship *Maui* at San Francisco; crew refused to clean tanks; ship still tied up after 17 days.
103. December 10-December 11: Steamship *Hegira* at San Francisco; crew trouble; east coast agreement; demand west coast; 1 day.
104. December 10-December 11: Steamship *Iowan* at San Pedro; Filipino crew, stevedores walked off; 1 day.
105. December 13-December 13: Steamship *Golden Hind* at San Francisco; unlicensed crew walked off, picketed ship; longshoremen quit; oilers refused to oil winches. Misunderstanding; released same day.
106. December 14-December 14: Steamship *Willhilo* at San Francisco; crew demand discharge of chief steward; few hours.
107. December 14-December 18: Steamship *Willhilo* at San Francisco; again tied up, deck crew refuse to sign articles unless rider taken off the articles requiring crew to work cargo; 4 days.
108. December 16-December 16: Steamship *Mauukai* at San Francisco; crew trouble; released same day.
109. December 16: Steamship *Wildwood* at San Francisco; crew replacements demand west coast articles; still tied up after 11 days.
110. December 23-December 24: Steamship *Ohioan* at San Pedro, unlicensed crew refuse to sail with Filipinos; 1 day.
111. December 24-December 24: Steamship *Manoa*, crew refuse to connect oil hose, Standard Oil barge; released same day.
112. December 27-January 5: Steamship *Pt. Reyes* at New Orleans; crew demand cash bonus provided in strike rider, no strike existing; union furnished new crew; no concessions made; 9 days.
113. December 27-January 2: Steamship *Diamond Head* at Oakland, again tied up; crew refuse to clean tanks; Labor Relations Board granted extra wage for work; 6 days.
114. December 30-January 3: Steamship *Helen Whittier* at Hilo, unlicensed crew struck in sympathy with sealers, stevedores quit; 5 days.

115. December 30-January 2: Steamship *Mana* at Honuapo; crew struck in sympathy with scalers; 4 days.

116. January 1-January 2: Steamship *Pt. Sur* at Alameda; crew wrecked mess room; difficulty getting replacements; no specific complaint; 2 days.

117. January 2-January 2: Steamship *Mabolo* at Honolulu; sympathy strike; short time.

118. January 4-January 9: Steamship *Pennsylvania* at San Francisco; unlicensed crew demand west coast articles; no concession made; independent crew recruited; 5 days.

119. January 5-January 10: Steamship *Robert Luckenbach* at San Francisco; crew demand west coast articles; compromise made; 5 days.

120. January 6-January 10: Steamship *William Luckenbach* at San Francisco; crew demand west coast articles; compromise made; 4 days.

121. January 7-January 8: Steamship *Golden Harvest* at San Francisco; crew replacements demand \$5 per day; no concession made; 1 day.

122. January 8-January 10: Steamship *Edgar Luckenbach* at San Francisco; crew demand west coast articles; compromise; 2 days.

123. January 8-January 9: Steamship *Helen Whittier* at Honolulu, again tied up; crew demand return rider; no concession made; 1 day.

124. January 8-January 15: Steamship *Calmur* at San Francisco; crew demanded west coast articles; no concession made; 7 days.

125. January 18-January 22: Steamship *Mala* at Honuapo, unlicensed crew struck on account of alleged blacklisted longshoremen; no concession made; 4 days.

126. January 19-January 22: Steamship *Golden Coast* at Honolulu, account alleged blacklisted longshoremen; no concession; 3 days.

127. January 19-January 22: Steamship *Mau* at Honolulu, account alleged blacklisted longshoremen; no concession; 3 days.

128. January 20-January 22: Steamship *Makiki* at Honolulu, account alleged blacklisted longshoremen; no concession; 2 days.

129. January 20-January 21: Steamship *Pt. Clear* at San Francisco; crew demand overtime for cleaning cargo holds (sulphur cargo); Labor Relations Board granted extra pay, 1 day.

130. January 21-January 23: Steamship *F. J. Luckenbach* at San Francisco; sympathy with ships' clerks; company met clerks' demands; 2 days.

131. January 21-January 23: Steamship *Dorothy Luckenbach* at San Francisco; sympathy with ships' clerks; met demands; 2 days.

132. January 21-January 23: Steamship *K. I. Luckenbach* at San Francisco; sympathy with ships' clerks; met demands; 2 days.

133. January 21-January 22: Steamship *California* at San Francisco; crew demand discharge of east coast men; no concession; 1 day.

134. January 27-January 28: Steamship *Heffron* at Portland; stewards crew demand extra messman; no concession; 1 day.

135. January 28-January 30: Steamship *Jane Christenson* at Longview; crew demand strike rider; no concession; 2 days.

136. February 11-February 11: Steamship *Manukai*, San Francisco; crew refused to connect oil hose; crew finally yielded; short time.

137. February 14-February 14: Steamship *Heffron*, San Pedro; crew refused to take lines of Standard Oil barge; unions ordered men to work; 5 hours' delay.

138. February 14: Steamship *Californian*, at sea; smooth, calm weather; seamen refused to man lifeboats during life-saving drill; "incident" entered in log; no further action to date.

139. February 15-February 18: Steamship *Columbian*, at San Francisco; account controversy over number of trailers to be hauled by jitney; International Longshoremen's Association yielded; 2 days.

140. February 23-February 23: Steamship *Condor*, at San Pedro; crew refused to handle Standard Oil products; crew yielded; several hours delay.

141. February 26-February 26: Steamship *Pacific Ranger*, Portland; controversy over size of sling leads; union yielded; short time.

142. February 27-February 28: Steamship *Pt. Chico*, San Francisco; Firemen's Union refused replacements for five men discharged for insubordination; union yielded after Labor Relations Board hearing; 1 day.

143. March 2-March 5: Steamship *California*, San Pedro; crew refused take ship to sea, demanding west coast wages and agreements; crew yielded when United States attorney threatened prosecute them on mutiny charges.

144. March 6-March 9: Steamship *President Taft*, San Francisco; longshoremen sling load controversy; Labor Relations Committee ruled favor of employers; 3 days.

145. March 7-March 7: Steamship *Democracy*, San Francisco; union demanded company ship new chief steward; demand withdrawn; old steward shipped; several hours.

146. March 10-March 10: Steamship *Democracy*, San Pedro; deck and engine crew demand quarters be remodeled immediately; compromise work to be done at sea; several hours.

147. March 10-March 12: Steamship *Everett*, Seattle; longshore sling load controversy; Labor Relations Committee ruled favor of International Longshoremen's Association; three days delay.

148. March 14-March 19: Steamship *Manini*, San Francisco; Sailors' Union demanded deck boys be hired from union hall; matter referred to Bureau of Navigation; boys remained on board; 5 days.

149. March 17-March 18: Steamship *Maui*, San Francisco; Sailors' Union demanded deck boys be hired from union hall; matter referred to Bureau of Navigation; boys remained on board; 2 days.

150. March 20-March 22: Steamship *Antigua*, San Francisco; firemen refused to pass one man picket line set up by discharged junior engineer; Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association upheld discharge for cause; company agreed give discharged man another chance on another ship; 2 days.

151. March 25-March 26: Steamship *Manini*, St. Helens, Columbia River; crew demanded discharge of deck boys; boys intimidated into deserting; 1 day.

152. March 25-March 26: Steamship *Daisy Gray*, San Francisco; American Radio Telegraphists' Association demand radio man be carried; demand temporarily withdrawn; 1 day.

153. March 25-March 26: Steamship *Golden Bear*, San Francisco; crew refused to work after 5 p. m. unless paid cash overtime; longshoremen refused to work unless paid stand-by time; union furnished new gangs; 18 hours.

154. March 25-March 26: Steamship *Manukai*, Honolulu; crew drunk; demanded discharge of carpenter because "nonunion"; next morning, sober, discovered carpenter good union man; demand withdrawn; 12 hours.

155. March 26: Steamship *Manulani*, San Pedro; longshoremen sling load controversy; compromise load pending arbitration; half day.

156. March 27-March 30: Steamship *Scandia*, Willapa Harbor, Wash.; longshoremen refused to go through lumber mill workers' picket line; picket line withdrawn; 4 days.

Mr. NIMMO. I would like to take up that question of Bridges' refusal to handle a consignment of scrap iron on the motorship *Fella*.

Mr. KNOWLES. On April 2, 1936, Harry Bridges issued orders to the longshoremen that they should refuse to handle 15 tons of scrap iron consigned to the motorship *Fella* of the Libera Lines. Despite the fact that the cargo in question was properly cleared by the United States Customs Office, Bridges declared that it was "war contraband." Bridges issued the following statement:

We will handle this scrap iron only when and if Secretary of State Hull advises us that it is not contraband.

The motorship *Fella* had to sail that night without the scrap iron.

Mr. NIMMO. The significance of that, gentlemen, is that Bridges was taking political action into his own hands in respect to a cargo that had been cleared by the port authorities and putting himself in the position, within the communistic ideal, of determining what was contraband and how they would direct the use of the ships that were going in and out of our ports in respect to a war that had nothing to do—

Mr. STARNES (interposing). He was setting himself up as a de facto Secretary of State?

Mr. NIMMO. I think that describes it.

Mr. KNOWLES. It is a Communist teaching that if this country is ever embroiled in a war with which these people are not in sympathy it means trouble.

On the same date, April 2, 1936, the Pacific Coast Longshoremen carried the following article:

Mr. Thompson, representing the American Friends of the Soviet, addressed the membership. He had been invited by the board of trustees to outline and explain a proposition to send a delegate to the Soviet Union. He explained that such a delegate would travel with a large delegation of union representatives from all parts of the United States.

The Waterfront Worker of April 6, 1936 (see exhibit 1B), stated as follows:

PREPARE FOR ACTION

The seamen on the east coast are on strike, striking against the corrupt International Seamen's Union leadership, against the ridiculous charges of mutiny of the *California* crew and for west-coast wages and conditions. The *Santa Rosa* and the *Sage Brush* are headed for the west coast with a full crew of scabs. The Grace Co. has deliberately manned their ships with scabs. It is a clear-cut issue. Do we work with scabs? We must refuse to touch any part of the rat ship. One of the reasons we had to do considerable maneuvering in the past to avoid strike actions was the issues were not clear and they were not strong enough.

Now we have an open challenge by the shipowners on a national basis, which we cannot ignore. We have demonstrated to the public and to organized labor that we are not looking for trouble, but the present issue at stake is unionism. We cannot avoid it. We must fight.

The seamen's strike of the east coast, referred to in the above article, was not a strike but an attempt to create trouble on the New York water front by one Joseph Curran, a ringleader of the mutiny on the steamship *California* mentioned heretofore in this brief.

The steamship *Santa Rosa* had a full union crew aboard it but, because the International Seamen's Union men had the courage to defy Joseph Curran's "provisional strike committee," they were branded as scabs and the Communist Party immediately took up Curran's battle in the San Francisco Longshoremen's Union.

On April 3, 1936, Harry Bridges, speaking before the San Francisco Central Labor Council, stated as follows regarding the steamship *Santa Rosa*:

On the way from New York there are ships manned entirely by scabs. There is the *Santa Rosa* with a crew of 350. We don't believe it's coming here just for the trip. It is going to load passengers and freight. We can stand by idly, where we can see that it is not done except by union men. The maritime unions can't stand idly by and see the things they fought so hard for taken away from them.

We have done all we can to avoid these things. Now we believe the organized forces against us are ready. We have no alternative. The east- and west-coast shipowners are acting together.

The *Santa Rosa* docked on April 14 at San Francisco and immediately maritime federation pickets were put out to prevent longshoremen from going on the dock to work the cargo. The Waterfront Employers' Association immediately suspended all relations with local 38-79.

For the benefit of the committee we will point out discussions leading up to this particular situation.

On February 3, 1936, local 38-79 voted to boycott east-coast ships coming to the Pacific coast with crews that replaced "striking sea-

men." On April 6 Bridges advised the Grace Co. that the liner *Santa Rosa* would not be worked unless the International Seamen's Union crew was discharged and replaced with seamen meeting his approval under full west-coast agreement. On April 8 San Francisco Council No. 2, Maritime Federation of the Pacific, adopted a resolution to boycott ships such as the *Santa Rosa*. On April 10 the San Pedro District Council No. 4, Maritime Federation of the Pacific, at the request of Harry Bridges, adopted a similar resolution. On April 13 the *Santa Rosa* docked at San Pedro, Calif., to discharge passengers and mail, but no attempt was made to work cargo there. The *Santa Rosa* then sailed for San Francisco.

On April 16, local 38-79 held a mass meeting and Bridges and other Communists introduced a strike resolution.

The morning of April 17 saw squad cars from local 38-79 patrolling the water front in order to prevent longshoremen from applying for work at the dock. The Maritime Federation of the Pacific rescinded its resolution declaring all east coast ships "hot" and the San Francisco Central Labor Council appointed a committee of seven to assist in peace negotiations.

It is significant to note that at this time the San Francisco Central Labor Council refused a vote of confidence to Harry Bridges and his leadership.

The committee's attention is again invited to the mass meeting held at the Dreamland Auditorium on April 16, 1936, where the International Longshoremen's Association voted complete confidence in Harry Bridges. At this meeting a vote was passed to send Bridges and Ralph Mallen by airplane to address a mass meeting at Portland, Oreg., on the following Sunday, and Otto Kleiman was dispatched to San Pedro to address a mass meeting of the I. L. A. local there. Please note that all of the ambassadors were members of the original Equity Hall group and members of the Communist Party.

We have dealt with the subject of the S. S. *Santa Rosa* quite at length because it plays an important part in the relations between the Waterfront Employers' Association and the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. The suspension of relations with local 38-79 was not directed at the local, but purely at the radical and Communist leaders of that union.

Over a period of 18 months since the Hanna award was granted, there were more than 400 flagrant violations by this union of their agreement and their refusal to work cargo on the S. S. *Santa Rosa* was the culmination of an interminable series of strikes.

The negotiation committee which was appointed by local 38-79 to meet with the employers included John Marlowe. He was presumed to be next in line for president of local 38-79, and the Communist Party felt that he would go along with Bridges in the negotiations. To the surprise of everyone Marlowe went with the conservative side and a tentative agreement with the employers was signed on Saturday night, the 18th.

The party immediately had to change its tactics and a wire was sent to Harry Bridges in Portland ordering him to return immediately. The best was made of a bad situation and another mass meeting was called at which time Bridges declared that a victory had been

gained for their local 38-79. Bridges did, however, force the negotiating committee to issue the following statement:

We, the committee, are taking this position now, realizing we have mistakenly and inadvertently disobeyed the instructions of our membership at their last meeting, and to convince the membership that our mistake was honest and unintentional, we wish now to publicly announce our mistake, and declare the tentative memorandum that we signed absolutely without authority, is null and void.

Despite this repudiation, however, the agreement was signed on April 21 and the longshoremen went back to work.

The ink was scarcely dry on the agreement concerning the *Santa Rosa* and future respect of contracts, when another "job action" was called. This was purely political in character and similar to the incident of the *M. S. Fella*, which we have heretofore reported. The *M. S. Feltre* of the Libera Line was refused handling by the longshoremen on the grounds that it was loading scrap metal for Italy. In reality, this scrap metal was being consigned by the Italian San Francisco colony to the Italian Red Cross and did not come under the classification of contraband.

There was no cessation in "hot cargo" disputes or "job action." It became increasingly apparent that the water front employers were going to have to make amendments in their contract when the present award expired.

Mr. NIMMO. Now will you refer, Mr. Knowles, to the resolutions that were adopted at the International Longshoremen's Convention at San Pedro on May 5—the object of that being to note the Communist pattern of these resolutions, which fit right into the party doctrine.

Mr. KNOWLES. On May 5 the International Longshoremen's Association convened at San Pedro, Calif. It resulted in a sweeping victory for the Equality Hall group. Among the resolutions introduced by this group were:

1. Endorsing the principle of the industrial unions as advocated by John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers.
2. To organize flour mill and cereal industrial workers as International Longshoremen's Association affiliate.
3. Declaring embargo on munitions of war, including scrap iron.
4. Requiring that not less than 5 percent of new men registered be Negroes.
5. Authorizing representatives to the National Negro Congress.
6. Giving active support to the Modesto Defense Fund and Tom Mooney.
7. Stop work in each port 1 hour during the Modesto appeal.
8. Repeal of the California Criminal Syndicalism Act.
9. Assessing all longshoremen \$1 for contribution to the Democratic campaign fund. Money to be sent to James Farley, 30 percent to be used in Pacific coast States.

Mr. NIMMO. That was a resolution adopted at the International Longshoremen's Convention?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct.

Mr. NIMMO. And the importance of that is the definitely Communist pattern of that resolution, all the way through.

Now, we take up Bridges' election to the district committee.

Mr. KNOWLES. A resolution endorsing a Farmer-Labor party, introduced by the Equality Hall group failed to pass.

Bridges won the nomination for district president and was later elected.

Shortly after the International Longshoremen convention at San Pedro, the official publication of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, the Voice of the Federation, published an article advocating a transportation federation of America under the caption "Organize, or Else." We give it here verbatim:

One of the most important issues that is facing the workers in the marine transportation industry today is the question of industrial unionism.

In order to protect ourselves, our membership should include all forms of transportation, passenger as well as freight, both on land and sea and even in the air. This form of organization will have to be started now, lest the structure on which we are now standing, crumble under our feet.

It is becoming apparent that the destruction of our present set-up already exists within our form of organization. The closely interlocking functions of the various branches of the transportation industry makes it absolutely necessary for the workers in the various branches to act as one group.

If they fail to do so, they will find that when the freight tariff in the marine transportation becomes higher than the rate charged by rail, bus, or air, due to the fact that the workers in that branch are being better paid, or work under better conditions, then the freight and passenger revenue will automatically be transferred into the branch where the workers are working under a lower standard of living.

In other words, when the irregularity of service or the higher rates on ships annoys the public, then they will send the freight and travel by rail, and when that happens, the ships will be laid up. Since our members are skilled in the sailing of ships, their value will be depreciated even should they eventually be absorbed in the branch of the industry in which the increase in traffic has occurred.

Therefore, in order to keep the employment and earning power stable, we must affiliate ourselves with the other branches until the workers in the transportation industry control every unit of transportation whether it flies, floats, or runs on wheels, and when that organization has been perfected, we will have in our hands the key that will open the door to a more abundant life not only for the workers in our industry, but for all workers.

The ambition of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific was to extend its influence. Therefore, organizations were set up on the Gulf and the Atlantic coast, with the intention of forming a national maritime federation, but their ambitions did not end there. It was their hope, when the National Maritime Federation was formed, to extend its influence internationally. This ambition was the fundamental of the Comintern in its international effort to control the transportation facilities of the entire world.

We have already called the attention of the committee to the cooperation of Harry Bridges on the west coast with Joe Curran on the east coast which resulted in the *Santa Rosa* incident.

By June 1, 1936, the situation in the American Federation of Labor regarding the fight with Mr. John L. Lewis was becoming serious. Already the hand of the Communist Party was in the Committee for Industrial Organization. There was no doubt that the Communist Party would take advantage of this situation and bore into the Maritime Federation, which it proceeded to do.

On the first Saturday and Sunday in June 1936 Communist District No. 13 held its convention at Willapi Hall on Saturday and the New Bayshore Hall on Sunday, in San Francisco. At this conven-

tion a representative of the Comintern gave instructions to District No. 13. The Sunday meeting was interrupted about 5:10 p. m. by police, who had been informed that a fight was in progress, but after the police left an election was held.

At this election Mr. Harry Bridges, president of District I. L. A., was elected as a district committee member of District No. 13 of the Communist Party and was also constituted a bureau member of District 13.

We request the committee at this time to call the witnesses indicated in the list of witnesses attached to this report to substantiate the above.

The district bureau formulated the following policy to be submitted to all concerned:

First. That it was the intention of the party to keep peace in the United States and on the Pacific coast in particular until after the general election.

Second. That the Communist Party was going to use every effort to bring the Sailors' Union of the Pacific back into the International Seamen's Union, in order that they could control the whole maritime situation on the Pacific coast.

Third. That they were going to use the Seamen's Union as a bone of contention if the shipowners opened the award, rather than the International Longshoremen's Association.

Fourth. That in any event, if and when awards were opened either by the shipowners or the longshoremen's association, they would agree to an extension of the agreement for a period of 1 year regardless of the terms therein, but with no intention of keeping the agreement after April 30, 1937.

Fifth. That they would assist in every way the organization of the Industrial Unions.

Sixth. That when Mr. John L. Lewis had accomplished the organization of the steel, rubber, automotive industries, they would then break the awards on the Pacific coast, Gulf, and Atlantic coast, and cause a Nation-wide general strike.

Seventh. That they would increase the membership of the Newspaper Guild and establish nuclei in the various newspapers so that they could control the presentation of news by the papers at the time of the calling of the general strike.

Witnesses whom you can call later will substantiate these statements.

Mr. NIMMO. The point of that, Mr. Chairman, was, as I understand it, that the award of 1934 would have terminated in 1936; would it not, Mr. Knowles?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIMMO. And, not wanting it to terminate in 1936, they desired to put it over until April 1937. If they put it over until April 1937, then it would tie in with the general strikes throughout the United States which would result from action by John Lewis in the East; and otherwise the natural thing would have been to have had another award or another contract with the ship owners about the expiration of the 1934 contract.

Mr. KNOWLES. With the assistance of the Communist Party, Bridges proceeded to gain absolute control of the I. L. A. and the Maritime Federation. Emissaries were sent to the Gulf to organize the Gulf.

One J. W. Allen, alias Von Ermen, was the party functionary used in the Gulf. He was a former relief officer for the Matson Line.

Roy Pyle, of the American Radio Telegraph Association, proceeded to New York and consulted with Roy Hudson, president of the Maritime Workers' Industrial Union and a member of the central committee of the Communist Party of the United States. There they formulated a policy for coordination of activities on the Atlantic coast that would follow the leadership of Harry Bridges on the Pacific coast.

After Earl Browder had accepted his nomination for the presidency on the Communist Party ticket, he proceeded to the Pacific coast and visited with the bureaus of districts 12 and 13.

At the time of Browder's visit it was still considered necessary to maintain peace, but at this time the shipowners decided to open the award. After the first few meetings between Maritime representatives and the shipowners, it became apparent to the Communist groups what tactics the shipowners had decided to follow. This necessitated a change in plans on the part of the Communist Party and the Equity Hall group on the Pacific coast.

Roy Hudson was sent to the Pacific coast and remained in San Francisco directing all negotiations of the party in the Maritime Federation and newspaper organizations for the whole Pacific coast. The first result was an order on the part of the party to stiffen the attitude of the unions, and finally the following statement was issued to the party by the Bureau during the last week in August 1936:

1. We must exploit the situation with all its implications to the end that—
 - (a) A general improvement all around of conditions of labor, hours, wages, etc., for longshoremen.
 - (b) Decided improvement of labor, hours, wages, etc., for seamen.
 - (c) General improvement for all other crafts in the shipping and maritime industry.
 - (d) The setting up of a more inclusive provisional apparatus with a view of taking the Maritime Federation of the Pacific a step higher in the direction of industrial unionism.
 - (e) Unofficial representation on the C. I. O. (John Lewis' new "Committee for Industrial Organization").
2. Finally under no circumstances to fail to take advantage of the general favorable situation to the end that—
 - (a) The Communist Party shall increase in influence and membership.
 - (b) The people's front shall advance immeasurably, and;
 - (c) Moral and financial aid shall be given to the C. I. O. in the fight against the reactionary A. F. of L. leadership.

MARITIME STRIKE POLITICAL NECESSITY

3. Further, in the matter of the Pacific coast maritime situation it is decided—
 - (a) A general maritime strike is not only possible but a practical political necessity.
 - (b) Every effort should be made to conduct negotiations in such a way as to gain the moral prerequisite for a strike, should serious gains otherwise be impossible.
 - (c) Loose connections with the Northwest must be strengthened by means of unlimited support to the P. I. Guild newspaper strike and to the aspirations of certain leaders.
 - (d) At the same time a definite understanding must be worked out between the Buros, Harry Bridges, California, Morris Rapport, Washington, and the leadership of the Washington Commonwealth Federation with a view of complementing the general situation—guild strike, marine strike—in such a way that one may lead to the other.

4. It must be understood that we must conduct ourselves in such a way as to advance—

- (a) The perspectives of a new manifold upsurge of class struggle;
- (b) The definite realization of a Farmer-Labor Party alinement of the west coast; and
- (c) The bringing about on the west coast an internal alinement similar to the C. I. O.

Mr. NIMMO. The reference there to the class struggle is definitely a communistic suggestion. It has nothing to do with labor unionism.

Mr. KNOWLES. We desire at this time to introduce a confidential memorandum covering the above, and request that it be marked exhibit No. 25.

We shall now return to the Maritime Federation convention which ended in San Pedro on June 10, 1936. The Maritime Federation adopts the following resolutions:

1. Endorse campaign for repeal of criminal syndicalism law and release all persons in jail for same.
2. To designate July 5, Bloody Thursday Maritime Memorial Day, calling upon all affiliated unions to observe this by work stoppage. (This was referred to a referendum.
3. Protest aggressive war and fascism.
4. Embargo on war materials.
5. Authorize Maritime Federation district mass meetings for all member unions at least once a month.
6. Organize Maritime Federation in the district of British Columbia.
7. Organize National Maritime Federation embracing all phases of marine transportation industries.
8. Recommend that radio telegraphers make September demand that they be not required to do clerical or purser work.
9. Set definite rules for sailors and longshore work on steam schooners.
10. Establish a Mooney defense committee in each federation district. Sell 40,000 "forty-five cent" "Free Mooney and Billings" stamps.

The perusal of these resolutions is enough to point out to the committee the control of the Equality Hall group and the Communist Party.

On July 5, 1936, the Maritime Federation staged its "Bloody Thursday" parade. They claimed that 10,000 men marched in the parade.

On July 9 it was announced that Harry Bridges had been elected president of the district I. L. A. for 1936-1937.

On July 22 the Maritime Federation of the Pacific announced that all propositions on referendum ballot had carried and then called for a coast-wide meeting on the proposed September demands to be held on August 4 and 5, in San Francisco.

These resolutions that were passed by the referendum set up the federation not as a negotiating agency, but merely a coordinating agency with power to block negotiations that any occasion might demand. Their plan, briefly, was to authorize the federation as a coordinating agency which would approve demands and force employers to sign with all unions simultaneously. To split employer organizations by dealing with individual employers and individual groups of employers, one at a time. All agreements were to include:

- (a) Right of union men to refuse to pass picket lines.
- (b) A guarantee that there would be no discrimination against any man because of union activities.
- (c) A preferential agreement clause.
- (d) Recognize the right of unions to take joint action to enforce agreements.

On July 31, 1936, the Waterfront Employers served formal notice on I. L. A. district officials and four major locals that they intended

to "open the award" and suggesting that negotiations be started at the earliest possible date and made the proposal that all issues not settled by September 1 be submitted to arbitration on that date or immediately thereafter, in order to eliminate any possibility of a non-agreement interim after September 30.

We point out to the committee at this time that it was not the intention of the Equality Hall group to want any strikes in 1936 and that the seamen were being used as the "catpaw" to effect trading with the Waterfront Employers.

The August 17, 1936, Western Worker published the following editorial:

Obviously, the waterfront unions cannot at this time state that they are prepared to submit all disputed points to arbitration. The union men are determined to win certain burning minimum demands which will make life on board the ships less of a hell of exploitation. To agree at this time to submit these essential demands to arbitration would in effect be a surrender of these demands to the shipowners.

The significance of this quotation is the fact that it does not refer to the longshoremen, but to the seamen, and was the first step of the Communist Party to further its program of having the seamen carry the battle.

On August 19, 1936, the Sailors' Union of the Pacific notified the employers that all agreements and awards would terminate September 30. The Sailors' Union of the Pacific offered to negotiate their agreements, but insisted that these agreements must be with the Sailors' Union of the Pacific alone. Both the Sailors' Union of the Pacific and the Firemen's Union rejected the employers' offer to an immediate agreement to arbitrate all unsettled issues as of September 1.

Negotiations with the International Longshoremen's Association began on August 24, but after a full week of meetings they were still deadlocked on the question of submitting all disputed issues to arbitration. This was merely stalling on the part of Harry Bridges and his group in order that the Seamen's Union be pushed to the front.

During the first week of negotiations, after the Waterfront Employers had notified the maritime unions that they were going to open the award, the split occurred between the Seamen's Union and the Longshoremen's group. During this period the murder of George Alberts had been discovered and the body of Cherbourg had been taken from San Francisco Bay.

On August 29, a telegram was received in Seattle from San Francisco, which we introduce to this committee and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 26," from which we quote as follows:

Party status is definitely changed. Still do not want strike but ready and willing to go through with it if necessary for radicals to retain control of maritime unions. Party prepared for long and bloody strike, although denial of firearms and ammunitions. This denial does not check with other statements. Statement made Alameda murder definitely linked with maritime situation and to expose those guilty will involve maritime union individuals to extent so great that too dangerous for informant.

On August 31, 1936, Mitchell of the Vancouver, B. C., longshoremen received the following wire from Harry Bridges:

Word tonight from Lewis that he and his followers were with you, so if you walk out we will make it a big one; that is all we need.

On the same day Whitehead, of Seattle, phoned to Vancouver, B. C., that he had received a wire from Harry Bridges, reading as follows:

Nothing can stop wide-open break between employers and I. L. A. and maritime federation. It looks only a few days away.

Whitehead then quoted from a letter he had received from Bridges, as follows:

The men in Frisco do not want to take a vote on it and say, why not tie up shipping now and let the employers come to us? With all shipping tied up tight they will make a much better settlement than we would, so anything may happen anytime not even waiting for a vote to be taken, for the taking of a vote would go solidly for a strike.

At noon the same day, Mitchell in Vancouver, B. C., received a wire from Bridges:

Today after refusing to consider offer by employers several times re wages we agreed to put the matter before our men and the referendum at once will allow us to carry on and at the same time give us our vote to be sure where we stand.

Later in the afternoon Whitehead wired Mitchell from Seattle:

I am instructed to inform you that you are to hold a referendum vote the same as on this side. You will receive full instructions on Wednesday or as soon as I have time to prepare them.

On September 1, 1936, Landye came in to Vancouver, B. C., from Seattle and met the local men at the Labor Temple. He stated:

We expect you to get us a big vote to reject any offers. It will be in reality a strike vote. Commence voting Thursday morning and take 4 days to finish. That will be Monday, September 7, at 8 p. m. Make your report by noon on Tuesday, September 8, to reach Bridges in time for tabulation that evening in Frisco, then action with the employers the following day, Wednesday, September 9. The employers think it will be the middle of the month, but Bridges will fool them.

We desire to enter the confidential memorandum containing the above quotations and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 27."

On September 4 Harry Bridges informed the San Francisco Central Labor Council that he was advising the men to prepare for a strike. It was the consensus of opinion by disinterested observers at the time that when the strike vote was taken to determine whether the employers' proposals would be submitted to arbitration that the results would depend upon the way the ballot was prepared.

At this time we offer in evidence the official longshoremen's ballot to be voted on September 10, 11, and 12, 1936, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 28."

The attention of the committee is called to the peculiar manner in which the employers' proposals are presented, together with the question as framed.

During this period the steamship *President Hoover* was tied up. We mention it at this time because it is an excellent example of the determined campaign of the Maritime Federation to destroy discipline on the American merchant ships. This was a campaign to destroy the authority of the master and other officers and to substitute committee (Soviet) rule by the crew.

Early in 1936 union officials instructed all seamen to keep a careful record of "all infractions of navigation laws and of the arbitration award and to enforce the award and the navigation laws." In other

words, the crew was to replace the authority of the United States Government in law enforcement.

Open trouble developed on the *Hoover* at Honolulu on August 21, 1936. The ship was scheduled to sail at 10 p. m. At 9:30 p. m. a delegate, Brenner by name, advised Captain Yardley that the deck crew would not permit the ship to leave the dock until all hatches were battened and all gear secured. Captain Yardley advised the ship's delegate that the vessel would proceed as customary, securing gear as they sailed down the harbor, but that in event the gear was not secured and hatches were not battened by the time the reef was reached, the vessel would heave to until such work was accomplished. The captain warned the men that if they refused to work he would log them 2 days' pay for every infraction of the rules.

At sailing time, the deck crew assigned to the watches remained below. They did not report to their stations until 20 minutes later, at which time the vessel proceeded down the harbor, battening hatches and securing the gear as is customary.

In accordance with his warning, Captain Yardley logged four members of the deck crew for disobedience of orders and for delaying the United States mails, fining them 2 days' pay for each count, or a total of 4 days' pay. The vessel arrived in San Francisco at 11:30 a. m., August 26. The morning of August 27, the company started to pay off. The deck crew refused to accept their pay unless the 4 days' logging were remitted. The shipping commissioner advised the men and the captain that "a 2 days' fine for refusal to obey lawful orders of the master was correct."

Despite this, the sailors still refused and the remainder of the crew, both engine department and cooks and stewards, likewise refused to accept their pay. When the ship returned to San Francisco on September 1, Capt. John A. Rylander, United States Shipping Commissioner for San Francisco, conducted an investigation under orders from Joseph Weaver, Bureau chief in Washington.

In the investigation, Brenner, who had been the ship's delegate, readily admitted that Captain Yardley had said the ship would heave to inside the reef in case of hatches and gear were not secured by the time they reached the reef. "But," said Seaman Brenner, "there wasn't any room to heave to inside the harbor." "How do you know," queried Captain Rylander. "Have you seen the length of the harbor or do you know from personal knowledge?" "No," said Mr. Brenner, "but one of the men in the forecandle, who has officer's papers, told me so."

Delegate Brenner was not reemployed and when the *President Hoover* attempted to sail from San Francisco at 4 p. m. Friday, September 4, the members of the engine department and the cooks and stewards were signed on without difficulty, but the entire deck department refused to sign on unless Brenner was reemployed.

After the ship was tied up for 5 days and 21½ hours and with a loss of over \$50,000, the *President Hoover* finally sailed.

It is pointed out to the committee that while the money loss was negligible, the loss of prestige due to lack of discipline was in conceivably great.

We charge that the incident of the steamship *President Hoover* was inspired and controlled by a Communist nuclei on that ship.

At this time we desire to introduce to the committee a file entitled "Minutes, Joint Strike Policy Committee of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific," and request that this be marked "Exhibit No. 29."

We request the Committee to note that all quotations from this file will be marked in numerical order in red pencil.

Quotation 1, September 4, 1936, page 6:

Amended by Pyle, seconded by Rathborne, that we advise the coast committee of shipowners, the press, and all parties concerned, that if all misunderstandings now existing between the unions and employers are not settled by September 30, the maritime unions and the shipowners shall mutually agree to continue operations temporarily after October 1, under conditions now in effect with all unions until satisfactory new agreements are signed by all organizations affiliated with the Maritime Federation.

This amendment offered by Pyle and Rathborne, who are both Communists and members of the American Radio Telegraphers Association, was in direct line with the expressed will of the Communist Party as heretofore shown.

The party still felt that it could carry the present agreements over until April of 1937, at which time they felt that Mr. John L. Lewis and the C. I. O. would be ready to join with the maritime industries in a Nation-wide general strike.

Quotation 2 on the same page is as follows:

The firemen, sailors, and cooks' negotiating committees asked to be recorded as voting "no."

This shows a division already pointed out. The representatives of the Seaman's Union were going to have nothing to do with the policies of the Communist Party.

Harry Bridges and the Equality Hall group within the Maritime Federation had orders, however, that if the demands of the seamen were not granted and that if the seamen went out on strike, then they too would have to follow in the interests of unity. As the negotiations developed we shall see this group, under the leadership of Harry Bridges, continually stalling on the matter of a definite strike date.

On September 25, page 4, quotation No. 3:

Brother Bridges, International Longshoremen's Association, 38, reported that his organization had received a letter from the employers offering an increase in wages, substituting an 8-hour day for the 6-hour day, and the members to work off the docks. His organization representatives were to meet the shipowners' representatives at 11 a. m. Saturday morning and further stated that his organization was willing to proceed and work for the time being under the present award.

Quotation No. 4:

Brother Bridges asked this committee to go on record that all unions request the shipowners to suspend their ultimatum for 25 days for further negotiations, beyond September 30, 1936, and that the unions remain at work during this suspension, observing the conditions under the present agreements. Bridges, first; Canning seconded.

Quotation No. 5:

Amendment to read: "10 days and not more than 15 days." Coester, first; Cates seconded.

Quotation No. 6:

Brother Lundeborg speaks in favor of the amendment.

This desire for an extension of the agreement on the part of Bridges and the desire for an early termination on the part of Lundeborg is accentuated as negotiations proceed.

It is to be remembered by the committee that during all of this period, Roy Hudson, representative of the central committee of the Communist Party, was in San Francisco and cooperating with the Equality Hall group to see that the dicta of the Communist Party was carried out.

On September 23, 1936, the results of the membership referendum vote of the I. L. A. of the Pacific coast on the proposal submitted by the Waterfront Employers Association was returned. The votes in favor of the proposal were 489; and the votes against, 9,938.

It is interesting to note at this time that the I. L. A. voted on the employers' proposal and not on the question of whether the membership was willing to submit all disputed issues to arbitration.

The joint policy committee agreed upon an extension of 15 days after September 30, instead of the 25 days requested by Bridges. This in turn was accepted by the water-front employers.

On September 29, 1936, the Maritime Commission wired the Water-front Employers Association requesting an extension for 60 days. This the water-front employers refused to grant. On September 30 the Maritime Commission requested an extension for 30 days. The water-front employers then replied that they would grant a 60-day extension provided that prior to the 15th day of October each of the unions would notify the Commission and agree that any and all disputes not settled within the 60-day period would be submitted to arbitration before the Maritime Commission.

At a meeting of the joint strike committee of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific on October 14, 1936, Bridges suggested to the delegates that they go back to their membership and submit the proposal and put it to a referendum vote. This was just another delay in practice. Coester, speaking for the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, opposed this. Bridges states that the I. L. A. executive committee had gone over this proposal and thought that it was reasonable. As a result of this meeting, a telegram was framed to be sent to the Maritime Commission, the Secretary of Labor, and President Roosevelt, from which we quote, as quotation No. 7:

Joint negotiating committee representing all maritime unions takes this means of notifying you that they have attempted to cooperate to the fullest extent with the Maritime Commission to avoid a tie-up. The present 15-day extension granted at the request of the Commission has resulted in great unrest on the part of our membership, due to the employers' attitude in refusing bona fide negotiations. This situation has been aggravated by the Commission's latest dictatorial assumption of authority when the public and unions were looking to them to take a mutual and pacifying attitude. In view of the above, the negotiating committee of the maritime unions are submitting to their membership a referendum asking full authority to order strike action midnight October 28. This action to avoid tie-up through spontaneous action by our membership and to give the Commission a chance to correct damage they have done and use their authority to settle situations peacefully. Bridges, first; Cannalunga, seconded.

We give now quotation No. 8, page 6:

Brother Schmidt reported on the wire and the press release, stating that the press release had already gone, but the wire was held up on the advice of Mr. Aaron Sapiro, the sailors' legal counsel.

The telegram was then amended as follows:

Quotation No. 9, page 6:

Joint negotiating committee takes this means of notifying you that they have attempted to cooperate to the fullest extent with the Maritime Commission to avoid a tie-up. The present 15-day extension granted at the request of the Commission has resulted in great unrest on the part of our membership, due to employers' attitude in refusing bona fide negotiations. This situation has been aggravated by Commission's latest assumption of authority not yet in effect when the public and unions were looking to them to take a neutral and pacifying attitude. In view of the above and attempting to protect solely fundamental issues unions now have and feel are jeopardized, the negotiating committee of maritime unions are submitting to their membership a referendum asking full authority to order strike action midnight October 28. This action taken to avoid tie-up through spontaneous action by our membership and to give Commission chance to correct false impression left in the minds of our members and the public have used our efforts to settle situation peaceably by mediation.

JOINT NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE, MARITIME FEDERATION,
F. M. KELLEY, *Secretary*.

We point out to the committee the difference between the first and second telegrams, indicating the usual contempt of Bridges for representatives of the United States Government.

At a meeting on October 13 the following quotation, No. 10:

Brother Bridges thinks that we should not commit ourselves to such, but should take the middle ground and watch until the Commission is actually in effect, which will be October 26, 1936. His opinion is that the proper thing for us to do is to reply that the unions agree to the extension, with the provision that any benefits resulting from new agreements would be retroactive to October 1, 1936. The other alternative was to challenge the power of the Maritime Commission by inviting them to come here and show their power.

On page 6, quotation No. 11:

The committee for the proposed wire for the Maritime Commission returned and Brother Bridges reported that everybody was in accord with exception of the sailors' union.

The October 20, 1936, meeting of the joint committees appointed a committee to meet with the employers and the Commission. We cite quotation No. 12, page 1:

Brother Bridges further states that it was his understanding that the employers had a proposal to submit to the Seamen's Union of the Pacific. It was moved and seconded that each organization elect a committee of two to accompany the International Longshoremen's Association committee to meet the employers and the Commission.

The following committee was named by the respective organizations and elected by acclamation:

H. Muches.
W. Peel.
*H. O'Neil.
G. Charlot.
C. W. Labelle.
*H. Hook.
E. Coester.

D. Modin.
*R. Meriwether.
H. Gray.
*E. O'Grady.
*R. Pyle.
*A. Quittenton.

As this number amounted to 13, it was agreed that the International Longshoremen's Association would supply the remaining 7, Brother Melnikow making up the 21 representatives on the committee.

We desire to point out to the committee at this time that those whose names bear asterisks were members of the Equality Hall group and also members of the Communist Party.

On October 26 the United States Maritime Commission sent the following telegram to the joint strike committee:

Today the law creating the Maritime Commission came into full effect. All powers and authority conferred upon the Commission thereby are in full force. The duties of the Commission prescribed therein as well as its authority and powers are well known to shipowners and to maritime unions of the Pacific. The Commission proposes to carry out its duties to the fullest extent of its abilities and to use all the authority and powers conferred upon it to this end. It proposes to endeavor to see to it that full justice is done to the personnel manning our ships and that the rights of both shipowner and personnel are preserved and respected. The situation confronting our merchant marines due to the disputes between shipowners and the unions on the Pacific coast is of grave public interest and of first and deep concern to the Commission. As already announced, the Commission has begun an impartial investigation which will be full and complete. The Commission feels that the public interest requires that all shipping must continue to move during this investigation and repeat that it requests and expects that this will be done under latest agreement until the investigation is completed and the facts announced. You are requested to answer now unequivocally and without qualification the question: Are you going to respect the public and Government's interest to the extent that you will carry on under latest agreements without stoppage of work by walk-out or strike until the Commission's investigation is completed and facts announced?

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION.

On page 3 of the October 26 minutes of the joint strike committee, quotation 13:

Brother Curran took the floor. Reported that the east coast rank and file were going ahead with plans to support the west coast in all of its demands. Brother Curran thought some decision should be made at this time for the men on ships on both coasts such as an east coast ship being on the west coast, or a west coast ship being on the east coast in the event a strike is called.

We also give quotation No. 14 on the next page:

Brother Curran spoke about the necessity of establishing lines of communication between the east coast and the west coast.

We introduce those two quotations at this time in order that the committee may be advised that Joe Curran was on the west coast assisting Harry Bridges organize for the maritime strike of 1936. It is unnecessary for us to point out that Joe Curran's membership card in the Communist Party was introduced before this committee as evidence in its Washington, D. C., hearing.

The following telegram was then prepared and sent to the United States Maritime Commission at Washington, D. C., on October 26, 1936:

Acknowledging your telegrams October 24 and 26. Yesterday Admiral Hamlet informed representatives maritime unions he was not here to handle present maritime crisis and his official duties are confined to full investigation merchant marine. This in answer to unions request that hearings beginning this morning concentrate on unions fundamental issues protection of which would prevent strike October 28. At Commission's request unions agreed to extensions beyond September 30 again to October 26, believing Commission would act to prevent tie-up. This last-minute information from your representative that Commission is not interested in present crisis after misleading unions into belief they were has resulted in wasting much time unions could otherwise spend negotiating with those shipowners who have demonstrated they did not wish tie-up by their offering to grant full demands to some maritime unions. Your representative here abruptly adjourned hearings this morning denying either party right to make statements. The actions of Commission appear to us to coincide with the wishes of a radical minority of shipowners who apparently desire a tie-up regardless of ultimate results. Admiral Hamlet definitely notified maritime unions his investigation will be national in scope and may consume

from 6 months to 1 year which would require unions to continue under present coolie wages and conditions. This same program advocated by shipowners. Unions are disturbed at such a prejudiced attitude on the part of Commission which should be impartial. We further call attention to fact that shipowners who desire avoid tie-up represent large majority west coast shipping operators and are mainly nonsubsidized operators. Minority group foreign tie-up are depending heavily on subsidies they hope to obtain from Commission. Justness of our position is recognized by the offer of majority group of operators. Unless fundamental issues are agreed to by October 28 for all maritime unions strike will take place midnight on that date. Public and labor generally understands and is sympathetic to cause of unions attempting to correct conditions that are un-American and to that end indicate will support us. Present returns of strike vote indicate 95 percent in favor, but unions will continue cooperating with Department Labor officials to use every effort toward peaceful settlement by direct negotiations.

F. M. KELLEY,

Secretary, Joint Maritime Unions Negotiating Committee.

On October 27 the following letter was sent to the Honorable Edward F. McGrady, Assistant Secretary of Labor, by the joint strike committee:

We are advised that the coast committee of the shipowners have agreed to resume negotiations with the unions on Wednesday, October 28. It is our hope and our desire that we may be able to reach agreements on all points in dispute.

We request you to urge upon the coast committee of the shipowners that they concede to the respective unions so as to be immediately effective from October 28, 1936, and to remain in effect for the period of the agreement to be negotiated—to wit, 1 year:

(a) Preference of employment for all unions and continuation of the present system of hiring for unlicensed personnel.

(b) Cash to be paid for all overtime.

(c) The adjustment of the basis work day for the stewards' department, based on their request for the 8-hour day, to be worked over a span of 12 hours.

(d) Eight hours a day of radio work for radio operators.

(e) The manning scale for licensed officers to be negotiated on the basis of the 8-hour day.

(f) The continuation of the 6-hour day for the longshoremen.

If these basic requests can be met, negotiations can be continued, and we hope a speedy understanding can be reached on all points at issue.

Respectfully yours,

AMERICAN RADIO TELEGRAPHISTS' ASSOCIATION,
By (Signed) ROY A. PYLE, *Vice President*,
INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
PACIFIC COAST DISTRICT,
By (Signed) H. R. BRIDGES,
MARINE ENGINEERS' BENEFICIAL ASSOCIATION,
PACIFIC COAST DISTRICT,
By (Signed) R. MERIWETHER,
MASTERS, MATES & PILOTS OF AMERICA,
WEST COAST LOCAL, 90,
By (Signed) E. B. O'GRADY,
PACIFIC COAST MARINE FIREMEN, OILERS,
WATERTENDERS & WIPERS ASSOCIATION,
By (Signed) HARRY GRAY,
SAILORS' UNION OF THE PACIFIC,
By (Signed) HARRY LUNDEBERG,
MARINE COOKS & STEWARDS OF THE PACIFIC COAST,
By (Signed) DAVID MODIN.

We now quote from the October 29 meeting of the joint strike committee:

Quotation No. 16:

Moved and seconded that we postpone for 24 hours any strike action. Brother Lundeborg speaks against motion postponed for 24 hours. Brother Bridges speaks in favor of the motion.

This first meeting was held at 12:28 a. m. on October 29. Another meeting was called for 9 o'clock in the evening of the same day. The fight between Bridges and Lundeborg was accentuated, Bridges still desiring to carry on negotiations and Lundeborg demanding an immediate strike.

Quotation No. 17: From the minutes of this meeting, as follows:

Moved and seconded that at 11 p. m. we make the strike vote a special order of business. Bridges, first, Charlott seconded (both Equality Hall men). Amendment that this joint negotiating committee, by virtue of the power invested in them by referendum strike vote, hereby declare a strike beginning at midnight tonight on all lonshore, intercoastal, and coastwise vessels. The disposition of all vessels not covered by this motion should be handled by the joint strike committee: and that all ports concerned be notified of our action prior to midnight tonight. Farrell first, Lundeborg seconded.

Following this amendment another motion was made, quotation No. 18, as follows:

Moved and seconded that we table the motion and amendment. Schmidt first, Krumholtz seconded.

It is to be noted that both Schmidt and Krumholtz belonged to the Equality Hall group.

This meant that temporarily, at least, the Communist Party had gained its position.

Then in quotation No. 19 we find:

Brother Bridges stated that the fundamental demands of the International Longshoremen's Association had been granted, and in the event that there is a strike the International Longshoremen's Association will not be striking for these issues.

Quotation No. 20:

Brother Bridges stated that the International Longshoremen's Association had initiated this strike vote and they were going into it with more to lose than any other organization.

Lundeborg, however, finally gained the control of the joint strike committee and the vote to strike was passed. The following telegram was sent to Joseph Curran, chairman, Seamen's Defense Committee, 164 Eleventh Avenue, New York City:

Strike declared here midnight. Negotiating committee requests support for west coast for the ports, insofar intercoastal ships loaded or manned by seabs are concerned. Further policy adopted here is all ships return to home port before being struck unless worked or manned by seabs. Notify other ports.

(Signed) INNES.

A newspaper in San Francisco, commenting on this situation, says as follows:

Calling of a general maritime strike, in spite all efforts to prevent it, brought to light a new and peculiar situation, involving national politics and personal rivalries within the unions. Harry Bridges, leader of the longshoremen for the past 3 years and district head of the Maritime Federation, is said to have addressed the committee meetings as late as 11 o'clock Thursday night with an impassioned plea for delay, that he was shouted down, it is reported, after Harry Lundberg, secretary of the sailors' union, took the floor and insisted upon immediate action. The strike action brought the first defeat suffered by Bridges since he assumed dictatorship over the water front more than 2 years ago and apparently points the way to a new regime in maritime labor circles. Bridges and Lundberg have long been personal enemies, and, while the latter is as radical in his views as the former, it does not happen to be the right type of radicalism. Bridges has been playing a desperate game to retain his dictatorship over the Maritime Federation and swing it still further toward the left at the same time, and it is reported that after he had been talking strike for

months and had succeeded in getting the authorization to call one through the federation referendum, he found that his agitation had resulted in allowing the situation to get out of hand. Roy Hudson, of New York, head of the marine section of the National Communist Party, has been in San Francisco for several days and has been in conference with Bridges.

The details of the 1936 strike were quite different from that of the general strike of 1934. There was no attempt on the part of the shipowners to operate.

Bridges and the Equality Hall group, in order to hold control of the situation, had to make an about face. The party immediately got behind the struggle.

At this time we asked the committee to read the following articles to be found in exhibit 6-B, the Western Worker:

September 28, page 1, Bridges Replies to Shipowners Regarding Lockout Strike as He Terms It.

October 1, page 1, Place Blame on Shipowners For Any Lockout That May Occur.

October 5, page 1, Fifteen Days Truce Proposed on Waterfront.

October 12, page 8, Maritime Federation District Council No. 1 Gives Full Support to Strike.

October 18, page 1, Maritime Unions Unite to Take Strike Vote.

October 26, I. L. A.—Stand By All Sea-going Crafts.

November 2, page 1, Strike From San Diego to Alaska.

November 16, page 1, Editorial—Demands President Roosevelt Asked.

November 27, 1936, the American Citizen of San Francisco carried the following article. We quote as follows:

The striking maritime workers, 37,000 strong on the coast alone, are prepared to hold out until April, their leaders declare, and they could have just as well gone a bit further and threatened to continue their hold-out until May 1, the international day of Communist revolution, when the beginning of the strike was really scheduled according to plans announced at the Congress of the Communist International at Moscow several months ago.

We quote now from the San Francisco Daily News dated July 31, 1935:

Moscow, July 31—A strike on a vast scale among United States longshoremen when their agreement with shipowners expires in September was predicted to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in a speech yesterday by Samuel Darcy, one of the American delegates.

He said:

The result of the struggle depends not only on the work we will carry on on the Pacific coast. We count on the facts that through the efforts of all sections of the Internationale close cooperation by seamen and port workers in all countries may be guaranteed in a general and decisive struggle against the bourgeoisie. During the San Francisco general strike we established contacts with the International Sailors' and Port Workers' Union in Australia and The Netherlands, and their fidelity and cooperation evoked tremendous enthusiasm.

The international contacts of the working class requires special significance in connection with the danger of an imperial war.

On November 9, the Maritime Worker, mimeograph bulletin issued by the water front section of the Communist Party in San Francisco after it succeeded the Waterfront Worker, says as follows:

In the few years the Communist Party has been working in the marine industry, one of the most powerful maritime organizations in the world has been built up.

On November 15, Bridges spoke to the Western Writers' Congress in San Francisco, and said:

The present maritime strike may spread to another 150,000 or 200,000 workers. We are on strike and we are going to win. I hope that the strike will not spread, but that may be necessary. We have not yet called on our reserves.

On November 21, speaking at the San Francisco Labor Council, Bridges said:

No one knows better than we do how this situation effects other workers. We know that troops and machine guns may move in here again and we know that won't be any fun. But we would rather take a crack at the machine guns than go back to conditions as they were before 1934.

Bridges then proceeded to make an attack upon the whole I. L. A. structure on the Atlantic coast and against all the leaders of the American Federation of Labor by saying:

The International Longshoremen's Association on the Atlantic coast is a racket using 500 thugs and gangsters in smashing seamen's picket lines so longshoremen can scab on their striking brothers. They are playing the game of the shipowners and crossing the strikers back East before the shipowners move in on us here. And after this strike is over we will show them more of an inland march. I haven't heard any kicks from the boys in the front trenches of the inland march. The 1934 strike was localized. This strike is now national in scope. We have no fear. We know what the outcome will be. We expect help from the Government. Labor put this Government into office. We expect support and we are going to get it.

On December 8, 1936, a mass meeting was held in the San Francisco Municipal Auditorium where Harry Bridges entered into a debate with Mr. Roger Lapham, president of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. Those seated on the platform with Harry Bridges were Henry Schmidt, member of the Equality Hall group; Angelo Herndon, Negro Communist and national chairman of the Young Communist League; William Schneiderman, district organizer for the party; Frank Spector, party organizer for the Communist Party; Lawrence Ross, editor of the Western Worker; and Anita Whitney, State chairman of the Communist Party; E. B. O'Grady, of the Masters, Mates, and Pilots Association and Equality Hall group; Jennie Matyas, Communist; and George Woolf, president of the Alaska Cannery Workers' Union, and member of the Communist Party.

The following telegram was sent by the Communist Party to the San Francisco strike committee:

Greetings to the striking maritime workers of San Francisco and the labor movement which is giving such splendid support to your heroic struggle. The central committee of our party which has just concluded a 3-day session here has adopted a special resolution in support of your struggle and urged all of the party organizations to not only continue but multiply many times the support that we are giving to your fight. We realize that the big shipowners are trying to crush the maritime unions as a step toward a general attack on the trade-union movement and that this demand of the entire labor movement united and whole-hearted support for your struggle. We realize that the victorious outcome of your struggle will be a big step in the direction of the organization of the steel workers and the millions of other organized workers in their fight for better conditions and militant trade-unionism. We specially pledge ourselves to help the strike in the Atlantic and Gulf ports which makes the present maritime strike Nation-wide in character and of the greatest significance to the entire labor movement. Our central committee heard with the greatest regret the antiworking class action taken by the Tampa Convention of the American Federation of Labor and pledged itself to bring the fight for support of the American Federation of Labor members to your strike into every possible local of the American Federation of Labor.

At this time we request of the committee that the witnesses designated in the list pertaining to this report be called to amplify the above.

We shall now present to the committee a résumé of the situation as of December 31, 1936.

1. Declaration by Harry Bridges, district president of the International Longshoremen's Association and dictator of strike strategy for seven unions comprising the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, that the federation, or at least its strike committee, will not countenance any proposed settlements between the shipowners and individual unions—no striker will return to work until all demands of all the unions have been met.

2. Predictions by Bridges, at a strikers' meeting at Wilmington, on December 28, of a complete tie-up of Atlantic coast shipping within the next 2 weeks unless the striking unions on the Pacific coast win their demands.

3. New demands by the strike committee that the strike of the machinists—who are in no way connected with the Maritime Federation and are not employed by the shipowners or stevedoring firms—must be settled before peace can be had. Some 138 machinists are on strike in San Francisco and East Bay shipyards.

4. Threats by E. B. O'Grady, spokesman for the masters, mates, and pilots, that not only must shipowners agree to "preferential employment"—which means closed shop—for members of the union but that all licensed officers not members of the union would be forced to join or driven off their jobs shortly after the strike ends.

5. Imposition by the Warehousemen's Union, a subsidiary of the International Longshoremen's Association, of a "permit" system, whereby San Francisco businessmen are required to obtain permission from the union picketing committee to obtain their own goods, in no way involved in the maritime strike, from railroad cars or warehouses, and must have permits even to enter their own places of business.

6. Statements by the committee of shipowners that Bridges and his associates are blocking settlement of the strike by preventing the members of the two unions from voting on tentative agreements, and by making settlement on the Pacific coast contingent upon a victory of the outlaw seamen's group on the Atlantic coast.

7. Continuation of the "battle of statements," with charges and counter charges from both sides, in the newspapers. This course had been made necessary to acquaint the public, vitally concerned in settlement of the strike, with developments, and because the Bridges committee refuses to allow newspapers reporters to attend any of the conferences between the union spokesmen and the shipowners' committee.

8. Picketing of East Bay railroad yards and the restriction of alleged "hot cargo" by maritime and warehousemen's strikers.

9. Dismissal of Harry Bridges from a \$75-a-week job as organizer on the Pacific coast for the International Longshoremen's Association and from membership on the International Longshoremen's Association national executive board by President Joseph P. Ryan on charges that Bridges is disrupting the union.

10. Decree by William A. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, that the longshoremen must confine their organiza-

tional activities to the water front and marine docks, and that the organization of teamsters, warehousemen, and others on their "inland march" program was outside of their jurisdiction.

11. Threats by C. H. Jordan, secretary of the joint strike committee at San Pedro, that "there will be no settlement of the present maritime strike if the men have to return to work under the provisions of the Copeland bill", and charges that Secretary of Labor Madam Perkins had "betrayed" the maritime unions by promising that the law would not be enforced.

12. Evidences of internal dissension over conduct of the strike in the Sailors' Union of the Pacific and the Marine Firemen's Union.

13. Discharge of B. Mayes as editor and members of his editorial staff of the Voice of the Federation because Mayes resisted the attempts of the Communist Party, he declares, to dictate the policy of the publication.

After a 99-day stoppage of work, the second great maritime strike came to an end on February 4, 1937, when an agreement was signed with the water-front employers of the Pacific coast.

We have given to this committee the facts surrounding it and have paid particular attention to the Communist activity in preparation for it and during it.

The events of early 1937 and the creation of the Committee for Industrial Organization show to the committee that the general strike would have been inevitable had Bridges been permitted to keep the awards closed until April 30, 1937.

At this time we desire the committee to read from exhibit 6-C, the file of the Western Worker for 1937, an article entitled, "Preconvention Discussion of the Lessons of the Maritime Strike by Frank Spector." This will be found on page 4, February 11, 1937; page 4, February 18, 1937; page 4, February 22, 1937; page 4, March 1, 1937; page 4, March 4, 1937; page 4, March 8, 1937, and page 8, March 11, 1937. We give the following excerpts from these subexhibits:

The Pacific coast maritime strike, which after 99 days ended in victory, has exerted an enormous influence on the whole labor movement. Its lessons are of tremendous importance to the party in facing the immediate tasks ahead of us. The party played a great role in the struggle to maintain the unity of the workers, without which the strike could not have been successful.

IN EVERY PHASE OF STRUGGLE

The Communists in the maritime unions, both before and during the strike, participated in every phase of the struggle, whether on the picket lines, in the various committees for organizing relief, publicity, finances, picketing, and in the leading strike committees. But more important still, the Communists in the face of "red" baiting, mobilized all honest progressive forces in the unions to fight for a correct policy, and rallied the membership of the Maritime Federation, at every crucial point of the strike, against every splitting maneuver, whether on the part of the shipowners or within the unions' ranks, which threatened the success of the strike.

One of the major factors in the success of the strike was the correct policy of the Communists and other progressive forces, in laying the basis before last September 30 for joint action of all maritime unions, by fighting for the International Longshoremen's Association to throw its support behind the seamen's demands by solidarity action on a coast-wide scale.

* * * * *

DEFEAT OF TROTZKYITES

Another major factor was the crushing defeat of the disruptive and splitting tactics and policies of the handful of Trotskyite disrupters, who influenced and incited the syndicalist elements among the seamen to follow a line which was an obstacle to unity and at times seriously threatened the outcome of the strike.

* * * * *

The party carried on a campaign among the strikers for a farmer-labor party, linking up the maritime workers' struggles with the need for independent political action on a local, State, and National scale. . . .

* * * * *

ROLE OF THE WOMEN

Another important phase of the strike was the role of the women, particularly in the International Longshoremen's Association Auxiliary, in actively participating in the organization of relief and other phases of strike activity; and the work of the Young Communists among the youth, in organizing sports and other recreational and educational activity for the strikers around the union recreation center on the water front.

The Maritime Workers, weekly organ of the water front section of the party, and the Western Worker, were indispensable weapons in the fight for maintaining the unity of the strikers and in clarifying questions of policy, as well as explaining the broader political aspects of the struggle.

The Western Worker was distributed in thousands of copies, regularly, in the union halls and on the picket lines, and was as widely read and discussed as the Voice of the Federation, in spite of "red" baiting attacks and numerous attempts to bar it from union halls.

The role and influence of the party reflected especially in the recruiting of over 300 new members to the party from the strikers' ranks. The party organization as a whole reacted well to its tasks during the strike.

At this time we introduce two volumes of the Maritime Worker issued by the waterfront section of the Communist Party, district 13, and request that they be marked for the year 1936, exhibit 30-A, and for the year 1937, exhibit 30-B.

From the end of the strike on February 4 until the time of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific convention held in Portland in June, the major emphasis on the part of Harry Bridges and the Communist Party was placed upon the "Copeland discharge book" and the task of swinging the unions of the Maritime Federation into the Committee for Industrial Organization.

We refer the committee to the following quotations in the Maritime Worker:

Volume 3, No. 8, Unity Needed in Copeland Fight.

Volume 3, No. 8, page 6, John L. Lewis and the Supreme Court.

Volume 3, No. 9, New Marine Labor Bill Holds Threats.

Volume 3, No. 11, page 6, Bill Green Tries Union Busting Again.

Volume 3, No. 12, What Means National Unity.

Volume 3, No. 13, page 2, Heading Toward Unity.

Volume 3, No. 13, page 1, Problems for the Coming International Longshoremen's Association Convention.

We at this time quote from volume 3, No. 13:

Mainstay of the Maritime Federation, the decisions effected by the International Longshoremen's Association convention will be of special significance in the coming federation convention, and in the fight for a national maritime federation.

It is a far cry from the early days of 1934, when a handful of militant progressives along the Embarcadero were courageously fighting shipowners and the heartedly hated "Blue Book unions"—a fight to success for the first time in years, brought the Pacific maritime workers into action.

Let it be said here and now that despite the opinions of any individual or individuals, the rank and file seamen are well aware of the valuable role the longshoremen played in the successfully concluded 1936-37 strikes. Seamen as a whole are entirely aware of the progressive role played by the district International Longshoremen's Association leadership.

It is because of this that the rest of the federation will look to the results of the International Longshoremen's Association convention for continued progressive leadership.

Then to this end the rank and file longshoremen must follow the leadership which has brought them along the highway since 1934.

On to a national maritime federation.

From volume 3, No. 18, page 2, Convention Starts Monday, we quote as follows:

Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, is prepared to recommend to the convention that the district reaffirm its full support to the aims and activities of the Committee for Industrial Organization.

Volume 3, No. 20, page 1, For National Unity and C. I. O. Affiliation.

Volume 3, No. 21, page 1, All Hands Together.

Volume 3, No. 25, page 1, The Rank and File Want National Unity Under the C. I. O.; All Else Is of Secondary Importance.

The other organ of the Communist Party, the Western Worker (see exhibit 6C), prepared the way also for Bridges to carry the Maritime Federation of the Pacific into the Committee for Industrial Organization, and we request the committee to read the following:

Volume 6, No. 21, page 1, C. I. O. Drive.

Volume 6, No. 22, page 4, Work of Communists in the Big Maritime Strike.

Volume 6, No. 25, page 1, I. L. A. 38-79 Assails C. I. O. Expulsions.

Volume 6, No. 26, page 5, For National Unity of Marine Workers.

Volume 6, No. 28, page 8, Urge National Marine Labor Convention.

Volume 6, No. 30, page 8, Bridges' Recommendations on Some Vital Problems Before the I. L. A. Members.

Volume 6, No. 34, page 8, Radio Telegraphers now in C. I. O.

Volume 6, No. 35, page 1, I. L. A. Convention in Vital Issues.

Volume 6, No. 38, page 1, Seamen in New Stride to National Unity.

Volume 6, May 27, 1937, page 1, Bridges by Acclamation.

Volume 6, No. 33, page 1, National Maritime Union in Unity.

Volume 6, No. 44, page 1, Marine Unions Behind Ford Strike.

Volume 6, No. 45, page 1, Maritime Federation Convenes June 7, C. I. O. Main Issue.

Volume 6, No. 45, page 4, editorial, The Maritime Federation.

We charge at this time that Bridges, having failed to carry out the objectives of the Communist Party in the 1936-37 strikes, namely, to have that strike coincide with the strike in the automotive, rubber, and steel industries, did during this period, with the assistance of the other members of the Equality Hall group and the other sections of the Communist Party, by persuasion, threats, and intimidation force the maritime unions of the Pacific in to the Committee for Industrial Organization.

We maintain that a thorough perusal on the part of the committee of the articles heretofore quoted will convince the committee as to the accuracy of this contention.

The committee is now requested to examine the facts surrounding the convention of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific which opened on Monday morning, June 7, 1937, in Portland, Oreg.

Bridges had embarked upon a very dangerous move. His plan to carry the Maritime Federation of the Pacific into the Committee for Industrial Organization had to succeed or he would lose his entire power on the Pacific coast. He was well aware of the fact that if he failed the Communist Party had another leader in the person of Henry Schmidt ready to step into his shoes.

The Communist Party, however, had builded Harry Bridges well in the minds of all of the longshoremen on the Pacific coast as well as the members of the other marine unions. It was natural, therefore, that the greatest concentration of Communist Party functionaries that ever took place on the Pacific coast started at Portland, Oreg., at this time.

At the time of convening, the party expected little opposition and felt that the program could be rushed through in about 10 days, but when the opposition developed, the convention dragged on for 29 days with the Communist leaders losing ground every day.

Early in January the Communist Party had succeeded in ousting Barney Mayes as editor of the Voice of the Federation, and had replaced him with O'Neil whom they knew would take party instructions. From that time until the convention the Communist Party was in a position to censure every news release which reached the rank and file. They were also enabled to direct "quickie" strikes from committee rooms as every issue that came before the rank and file was referred to the committees controlled by the party.

At this time we refer the committee to exhibit No. 29, Minutes of the Joint Policy Strike Committee of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, wherein the committee will see that it was Harry Bridges who introduced the resolution to have Barney Mayes ousted from his position.

Among the Communist Party leaders and sympathizers in Portland during the convention were the following: John Brophy, at one time accused by John L. Lewis as being a paid agent of the Soviet Government—now officially representing Lewis as managing director of the C. I. O.; Harry Bridges, an alien and member of the Communist Party under an alias; Henry Schmidt, a member of the Communist Party and president of the International Longshoremen's Association, local 38-44 of San Francisco; Walter Lambert, member of the Communist Party in charge of all "industrial units" of the party on the Pacific Coast; Arthur Scott, membership director of the California district (district No. 13) of the Communist Party; John Schomaker, California Communist acting as a reporter for the Communist editor of the Voice of the Federation; Bill Schneiderman, secretary of the Thirteenth District Communist Party; Harry Jackson, alias Morris Rapport, district organizer of the Northwest District (district No. 12) of the Communist Party; Jim O'Neil, Communist editor of the Voice of the Federation who was "fired" during the convention; Joe Curran, Communist, east coast lieutenant of Bridges; James R. Maskell, Canadian Communist and delegate from the Inland Boatmen's Union; E. V. Dennett, Canadian Communist and delegate from the Inland Boatmen's Union; Paul Heide, California Communist and delegate from International Longshoremen's Association, local 38-44; V. Shar-

key, California Communist and delegate from International Longshoremen's Association, local 38-44; Leo D. Hemingway, Portland Communist and member of the Warehousemen's Union; Harry Gross, Portland attorney for the International Labor Defense and the Warehousemen's Union; Jim Murphy, organizer for the Portland section of the Communist Party; Bob Adams, Portland Communist and member of the International Longshoremen's Association; John Brost, Communist sympathizer; Harold Pritchett, Canadian Communist and president of the Woodworkers' Federation; O. M. Orton, Aberdeen Communist, active in the Woodworkers' Federation and C. I. O. movement, and others.

Harry Bridges registered at the Multnomah Hotel on his arrival in Portland. On Tuesday morning, June 8, he held an important conference with Walter Lambert in his hotel room.

At this time we ask the committee to consider why it was necessary for Bridges to hold a conference with Walter Lambert, who, while a member of the Communist Party in charge of all industrial units on the Pacific coast, had nothing to do with the Maritime Federation.

On June 15, 1937, a lieutenant of the Portland Police Department's detective division, made the following confidential report to his captain:

SIR: A top fraction of the Communist Party of the United States was held in room 314 of the Sherman Hotel, this city, at 4:30 p. m., June 14, 1937. Those attending were party members representing the twelfth and thirteenth districts of the party. The following are the names and connections of the party members attending the fraction meeting and are listed as to their rank and party standing:

No. 1. Walter Lambert, head of the industrial unit of the Pacific coast.

No. 2. Arthur Scott, head of the professional section and head of membership.

No. 2A. Harry Bridges, International Longshoremen's Association, San Francisco, thirteenth district.

No. 3. Harry Gross, attorney and legal advisor, International Labor Defense.

No. 4. Henry Schmidt (or Schmitt) president, International Longshoremen's Association 38-44, San Francisco, Calif.

No. 5. John Shoemaker, International Longshoremen's Association 38-44, San Francisco.

No. 6. Bob Moore, International Longshoremen's Association, warehouseman, 38-44, San Francisco, Calif.

No. 7. ——— Cohen and Green, connection unknown; thought to be with Sailors Union of the Pacific.

The meeting was held in the room of the above-named John Shoemaker. Schmidt lives in the room next door to this room at the Sherman Hotel.

The afternoon was taken up with a discussion of the reported finding of a bug or mike or as the newspapers say a squealer in the room of Bridges at the Multnomah Hotel. Second subject was that Bridges intends to fly to Chicago to meet John L. Lewis regarding an investigation by the La Follette committee to find the person responsible for the wiring of Bridges' room and the theft of credentials and other papers from that room. Bridges stated he would leave Portland by air on Tuesday, June 15.

Third subject was a slate of party members and sympathizers to be elected the new officers of the Marine Federation of the Pacific. The slate is as follows:

For president: James Engstrom, president, membership Marine Firemen, Water Tenders and Oilers. Sympathizer.

Vice president: E. B. O'Grady, secretary, Master, Mates, and Pilots, Maritime Federation of the Pacific. Sympathizer.

Secretary: Herman Stuyvelaar. Member of the Communist Party of the United States.

Plans for discouraging conservative leaders, rejecting resolutions not drawn up by the party, nominating and supporting officers sympathetic to the Communists' program, and the launching of agitation

and propaganda to insure the delegates' support of the C. I. O. were among the things discussed and decided upon at the fraction meeting.

The convention, however, voted against affiliation of the C. I. O. and left this matter to a referendum vote.

There is no question that the Maritime Federation was unanimously in favor of an industrial form of unionism both in principle and in spirit, believing that it was a more efficient tool in the hands of labor for bettering hours, wages, and working conditions. The federation, however, was not willing to give up what it already had gained under the American Federation of Labor for just a promise of something better under the C. I. O., particularly when that promise came from the Communist control leadership.

On Wednesday afternoon, June 9, Brophy took the stand for 4½ hours while the federation delegates fired questions at him regarding the C. I. O. At that time the delegates could not be sure that the C. I. O. would keep its promises. Brophy went to great length to assure the delegates that these promises would be kept.

We now refer the committee back to the original list of the Equality Hall group and request them to observe who it was of this group that introduced the following resolutions of the maritime federation which we will now quote.

A resolution was introduced by Jim O'Neil and Paul Heide, both Communists, to have the federation go on record as endorsing the financial drive of the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, to form special subcommittees in each district council to cooperate with the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy and to "go on record in full support of the Spanish workers and fellow trade unions who are waging a life-and-death struggle in defense of democracy and against fascism."

The King, Ramsey, Connor defense committee of the maritime federation introduced a resolution stating, "Whereas these men have been convicted on a framed charge of murder, and whereas their conviction was secured by an unholy alliance between the shipowners and district attorney, Earl Warren, of Alameda County, Calif., mouthpiece for the banker-controlled, reactionary California Republican machine, who banded together to conceal truth, defeat justice, and imprison three union leaders whose only crime was efficiency in raising wages and bettering working conditions; therefore be it resolved, that the maritime federation in convention here assembled, hereby affirms its belief in the innocence of these men and determination to lend every support to the fight for their freedom."

Henry Schmidt introduced a resolution for the federation to continue its 100-percent support for the freedom of Mooney and Billings.

Henry Schmidt and John Schomaker submitted a resolution to establish a "junior union movement" and the establishment of summer camps for the children.

Just as the Communist Party injected parts of the party's program into the convention through resolutions formulated at its various fraction meetings which Harry Bridges also attended, they also selected candidates for the various offices of the federation.

Among the candidates selected at the Communists' fraction meetings were James Engstrom for president and E. B. O'Grady for vice president.

As previously stated, the longer the convention met the stronger the opposition to the party program became. Fearing the conservative elements might check all control from party leaders by electing men opposed to communism, Bridges was given instructions to break up the federation should the opposition gain complete control. The Communists' plan in this case was to break up the federation if they could not control it and then build the C. I. O. from the fragments.

Being aware of this plan and knowing that Bridges would break up the federation under these circumstances, the conservative elements withdrew William Fischer from the race for president at the last minute and allowed Engstrom to be elected. It was felt that with Engstrom at the head of the federation the Communist Party would not dare break it up after building Engstrom up for the past 2 years and finally putting him in office.

We now offer to the committee a folio of telegrams sent and received at Portland, Oreg., during the 1937 convention, and request that this folio be marked exhibit No. 31.

We shall not quote openly in this report regarding the contents of the telegrams, but request the committee at this time to call the witnesses designated in the list appended to this report, to explain their contents.

A quotation taken, however, from a San Francisco newspaper dated June 21, 1937, will explain the meaning at least of some of these telegrams.

We quote from the American Citizen of June 21, 1937:

Assuming that the Communist members who were delegates from the maritime unions to the convention had a right to be there, perhaps Bridges can explain why it was necessary that such men as Bill Schneiderman, Walter Lambert, and Harry Jackson met with him in Portland. These men do not belong to any unions affiliated with the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. Perhaps it would be pertinent to ask Bridges the necessity of the important conference he held with Walter Lambert in his hotel room on Tuesday morning, June 8, especially since it is known that Mr. Lambert does not belong to anything except the Communist Party. And why does John Brophy, former bitter enemy and now chief aid of John L. Lewis, in the C. I. O., have to meet with Bridges and other members of the Communists who were not connected with the Maritime Federation?

The reporter found Roy Pyle and Jack Von Erman registered in adjoining rooms of the Lennox Hotel and John Schomaker, Bill Schneiderman, Walter Lambert, and Henry Schmidt registered right next door at the Sherman Hotel. It was interesting to observe the getting together of certain individuals and groups which unequivocally pointed out the work that the Communist Party was doing to further the aims and objectives of Bridges. And, of course, the reporter had no reason for knowing anything about the party discipline Mr. Bridges was subjected to during the first week of the convention.

It was interesting to note that Jim O'Neil, editor of the Voice of the Federation, received instructions from Mr. Kelly, secretary of the federation, not to accept any more news releases from John Schomaker. (We call the attention of the committee to the telegrams.) But, of course, Mr. Kelly did not know of the party connection between O'Neil and Schomaker, a connection which neither Mr. Kelly nor anyone else who is not a Communist can break or influence, and he may be still unaware until he reads this, that in spite of his injunction, John Schomaker continued in constant contact with O'Neil and supplied him with several news stories.

It was interesting to note the helpfulness of Joe Curran, the east coast "red" trouble maker, in assisting Bridges arrange the preliminary phases of the Portland convention. And it is understood that a lot of the members of the maritime federation unions would be very much interested in the deal

Bridges is said to have made with Curran and certain other interests to "putting the skids under Ryan," international president of the I. L. A.

From what he was able to pick up about the convention held in the hotels, the Portland reporter ventures to predict that if Bridges is given control of the maritime federation of the Pacific as a result of the referendum voting it into the C. I. O., John Lewis will appoint Bridges as the C. I. O. director for the Pacific coast, with power to appoint some 200 organizers. This would mean that a majority of these organizers will be members of the Communist Party as Communist sympathizers. It is further rumored that the C. I. O. will grant Bridges some \$30,000 to organize the agricultural workers of California under the C. I. O. All of which moves the American Citizen to quote the ancient observation that "There are none so blind as those who will not see," and to suggest to the non-Communist members of the maritime federation unions that they should awake and get busy forthwith, "less they find themselves the unwilling tools of a foreign organization."

At this time we request the committee to call the witnesses indicated in the list appended to this report for substantiation of the above.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder if I might interrupt you there.

You say in this brief that the plan was to have a Nation-wide general strike?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir. They were leading up to that—tieing in all rubber, automotive, and steel.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, they failed to do it?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you say that that resulted in members going into the C. I. O.?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the cause of the failure? I do not get that exactly. They failed to do it?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you think that resulted in the members going into the C. I. O.?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the lack of cooperation between?

Mr. KNOWLES. Steel, automotive, and maritime; they did not jell.

The CHAIRMAN. They did not secure the cooperation to start them all at one time?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. They were unable to carry them all out at the same time.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; if they could start a general strike throughout the country, that was to be desired, on their part.

The CHAIRMAN. That was their plan, but they never carried it out.

Mr. NIMMO. There is on page 141 of the brief a report of the Portland, Oreg., police department. It merely shows Bridges in a big fraction of the Communist Party meeting in the Sherman Hotel at the time of this convention, and it shows how the Communists were working right in that convention.

Mr. KNOWLES. This is a report of a lieutenant of the police department of Portland, Oreg.:

SIR: A top fraction of the Communist Party of the United States was held in room 314 of the Sherman Hotel, this city, at 4:30 p. m. June 14, 1937. Those attending were party members representing the twelfth and thirteenth districts of the party. The following are the names and connections of the party members attending the fraction meeting and are listed as to their rank and party standing:

- No. 1. Walter Lambert, head of the industrial unit of the Pacific coast.
- No. 2. Arthur Scott, head of the professional section and head of membership.
- No. 2a. Harry Bridges, I. L. A., San Francisco, thirteenth district.
- No. 3. Harry Gross, attorney and legal adviser, International Labor Defense.
- No. 4. Henry Schmidt (or Schmitt), president, I. L. A., 38-44, San Francisco, Calif.
- No. 5. John Shoemaker, I. L. A., 38-44, San Francisco.
- No. 6. Bob Moore, I. L. A., warehousemen, 38-44, San Francisco, Calif.
- No. 7. ——— Cohen and Green, connection unknown; thought to be with S. U. P.

The meeting was held in the room of the above-named John Shoemaker. Schmidt lives in the room next door to this room at the Sherman Hotel.

The afternoon was taken up with a discussion of the reported finding of a bug or mike or, as the newspapers say, a squealer in the room of Bridges at the Multnomah Hotel. Second subject was that Bridges intends to fly to Chicago to meet John L. Lewis, regarding an investigation by the La Follette committee to find the person responsible for the wiring of Bridges' room and the theft of credentials and other papers from that room. Bridges stated he would leave Portland by air on Tuesday, June 15.

Third subject was a slate of party members and sympathizers to be elected the new officers of the marine federation of the Pacific. The slate is as follows:

For president: James Engstrom, president, Membership Marine Fireman Water Tenders and Oilers. Sympathizer.

Vice president: E. B. O'Grady, secretary, Master, Mates and Pilots, M. F. of P. Sympathizer.

Secretary: Herman Stuyvelaar. Member of the Communist Party of the United States.

We have now presented to this committee in narrative form, a picture of the activity of the Communist Party in the maritime industry of the Pacific coast. We believe that this brief, the documentary evidence and the testimony of the witnesses have proved to the committee beyond any reasonable doubt that the Communist Party, through its agents, has had complete control of the maritime industry on the Pacific coast for the past 5 years.

We believe that the Communist Party and its agents have used the maritime industry of the Pacific coast to further a seditious conspiracy, and that the facts herein stated constitute adequate grounds for the United States Government to proceed against the leaders of the Communist Party involved and those affiliated with them in carrying out their instructions.

We therefore request the committee to place these facts before the Attorney General of the United States to the end that he may take the necessary action.

The CHAIRMAN. That concludes your first brief, and that will accompany the record as a part thereof, and will be marked as an exhibit.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the maritime brief. That will be marked exhibit No. 2.

(The brief referred to was marked, "Knowles Exhibit No. 2, October 24, 1938" and reads as follows:)

KNOWLES EXHIBIT No. 2, OCTOBER 24, 1938

MARITIME BRIEF

RADICAL RESEARCH COMMITTEE, DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA, THE AMERICAN LEGION

IN THE MATTER OF THE ULTIMATE AIMS AND ACTIVITY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FOREWORD

This brief presents the facts regarding the activity of the Communist Party in the maritime industry of the Pacific coast.

It is supported by documentary evidence and the testimony of witnesses. The names of witnesses to be called and a précis of their testimony is in a confidential appendix to this brief.

This appendix will be presented to the committee at its first hearing in the matter.

RADICAL RESEARCH COMMITTEE.

SEPTEMBER 15, 1938.

IN THE MATTER OF ACTIVITY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN THE MARITIME INDUSTRY

INTRODUCTION

This brief is offered as argument in the specific matter of activity of the Communist Party in the maritime industry. Particular attention will be paid to that activity in the ports of the Pacific coast.

For the history of the Communist movement in the United States of America we refer you to our basic brief heretofore introduced.

After the national convention of the Communist Party of September 1919, which was held in Chicago, the Department of Justice went into active opposition to stop the growth of this organization under the authority of war-prepared statutes. In 1924 these wartime statutes were repealed and the Communist Party had more freedom of action.

The great and increasing importance, as well as the menace to the national life of the Nation, caused the American Legion, the American Federation of Labor, and other civic, fraternal, and patriotic groups to campaign openly against the Communist Party.

One of the main issues involved was the fact of recognition by the United States and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. One of the major reasons that this recognition was looked upon with alarm was the fact that the Government failed to enact reciprocal deportation treaties.

The increasing menace of the Communist Party has caused the House of Representatives to have three investigating committees appointed. The findings of the Fish Committee and later the McCormack Committee were not sufficient to create an aroused public opinion to the extent that Congress took any definite action upon their recommendation.

Once more the Nation has been aroused. Strikes, public disorder, disregard for lawful authority, contempt of law-enforcing agencies, and intimidation of courts have been charged largely to Communist leadership.

This brief will, in narrative form, present for the consideration of your committee, documentary evidence and the testimony of witnesses to show that the Communist Party has infiltrated deeply into the maritime industry of the Pacific coast.

LONGSHORE LABOR ORGANIZATION

Inasmuch as longshore-labor activities have been the spearhead of the merchants' marine industrial disputes on the Pacific coast, we shall consider this:

Certain longshore-labor groups, building up the connection between them so that we may provide a chain of events. This will provide an understanding of the industrial controversy in the merchant-marine industry.

The longshoremen's group was one of the earliest organizations of labor on the Pacific coast. The riggers and stevedores' union was organized in San Francisco in the month of July 1853. After their organization they affiliated with the International Longshoremen's Association, an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor.

The riggers and stevedores grew in numbers and political power. The influence of the union in politics made possible a degree of freedom from arrest and conviction when economic crimes of this order were committed by members of the union. Labor crimes on the water front were viewed with more or less complacency by the police department and the municipal courts. As a rule the longshoremen were good workmen. They desired to do their work with efficiency and dispatch and when they were free from radical and too ambitious leadership there was little complaint to be found with them.

In 1916 the riggers and stevedores came under the influence of the Industrial Workers of the World. This organization became ambitious to control the longshore operations on the Pacific coast.

There were strikes in 1916 and 1919. Both these strikes were exemplifications of the aims and desires of the I. W. W., who infiltrated their members into the riggers and stevedores' union.

The Water-front Employers' Union of San Francisco had had satisfactory agreements with the riggers and stevedores for many years, but the new social order advocated by the Industrial Workers of the World wrought a decided change in the attitude of the union leadership. The contract in force in 1916 provided that there should be no change in any contract until a 60-day notice should be received from either party to the contract. This contract had been witnessed by Roland B. Mahaney, chairman of the Committee of Conciliation of the United States Department of Labor.

Without notice the riggers and stevedores made a demand for changes of the wage scale and in the working conditions, and also that they should receive official recognition by the employers by being placed on the board of directors of the employing company. This is a distinctive Industrial Workers of the World philosophy.

These demands were refused by the water-front employers' union, who took their appeal to the then Secretary of Labor, William B. Wilson. He approved the attitude of the employers and stated that the riggers and stevedores should proceed in an orderly way and according to the rules of their organization.

Mr. Wilson wrote his views to J. A. Madsen, secretary of the Pacific-coast district of the International Longshoremen's Association. He also sent Federal mediator, Henry White, to mediate the dispute.

The international officers were asked to intervene, all without successful results, and a strike was called June 31, 1916.

The docks were picketed, many riots and disorders occurred, and no person was permitted on the docks of the water front without the express written permission of John J. Murphy, president of the local.

The strike lasted until July 14, when it was called off without any gains to the riggers and stevedores.

On May 27, 1919, another strike was made. The previous demands were made stronger. This time they demanded that changes be made in wage scales and working conditions and that their representatives should participate in the ownership, profit, and the directorate of the employing company.

The owners made a counter proposition and, when a meeting was called, the union by a secret vote agreed to accept the new proposition made by the employers. The radical leadership, however, called another meeting and by a standing vote refused to accept the terms made by the employers. A rising vote, in violation of their own constitution, gave the opportunity to the radical members to intimidate the conservatives and, by threat of bodily harm, carried their point and called a strike for September 19, 1919. It is a peculiar matter of labor history that this strike has never been declared off.

It was broken by the water-front employers severing all relations with the riggers and stevedores and their organization, which gradually disappeared from the San Francisco water front.

The conservative element of the riggers' and stevedores' union, about 1,000 strong, sick and tired of Industrial Workers of the World and other radical leadership, left the riggers and stevedores union and formed an independent union under the name of Longshoremen's Association of the Port of San Francisco and Bay Districts. This was formed on December 10, 1919. The water-front employers' union recognized the new union and entered into a 5-year contract with them.

In the contract, arbitration boards, consisting of employers and employees, were provided for. It is significant that for the entire period that this agreement was in operation it was never necessary to call the arbitration board. Peace and efficiency prevailed and longshore work on the San Francisco water front was considered the most efficient in the country.

The new union was officered by conservative longshoremen, with John J. Bryan, president, and Emil Stern, the secretary and treasurer. These two, with the majority of the executive board, remained in office during the entire life of the organization. The membership was confined to American citizens or those who had applied for citizenship in the United States. The union never had a closed charter nor did they refuse to accept bona fide longshoremen or men who would become bona fide longshoremen. In order to be assured of tenure of employment, enrollment was not permitted beyond the number that might reasonably be expected to make a fair living in longshore employment.

The union also provided for financial and burial relief for its members. The dues were placed at 75 cents per month and the financial accounts were subjected to the scrutiny of public accountants. The financial officers were bonded to give added security to union funds. The union grew in numbers and finances and finally was admitted as a bona fide labor union by the Central Labor Council of San Francisco on November 27, 1927.

This union, commonly known as the "Blue Book" union, never affiliated with the International Longshoremen's Association, but efforts were made from time to time to effect such an affiliation.

In November 1926 National President Cloupeck, of the International Longshoremen's Association, had a meeting with President Bryan and Secretary Stern, of the "Blue Book" union, in the office of Paul Scharrenberg, secretary of the State federation of labor, and President Michael Casey, of the teamsters' union. The matter of affiliation was considered, put up to the "Blue Book" membership, and the membership declined affiliation.

The California State Federation of Labor, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, wanted the "Blue Book" union to come into the State federation. The "Blue Book" union was willing to so affiliate provided that they had local autonomy. This the State federation was willing to grant, but the International Longshoremen's Association refused to permit an independent union to join the State federation of labor.

When Joseph C. Ryan, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, tried to induce the "Blue Book" union to join the international, the matter was presented again to the union and a referendum vote taken, but once more the union refused by a very decided vote.

The vote angered Mr. Ryan very much and became a deciding factor later on in 1933 when, to show his displeasure, he refused to grant a charter to the "Blue Book" union when negotiations had been entered into at the request of Bryan and Paul Scharrenberg.

It was at this time, 1933, that Ryan made the fatal mistake of granting the charter to the new group of longshoremen under radical control instead of to the "Blue Book" union.

In October 1933 the Seventy-third Congress of the United States enacted the National Recovery Act, but strong efforts were put forth to establish codes of fair competition. Labor and industry had many meetings in various parts of the country in an effort to establish a code for the marine industry.

These meetings culminated in Washington, where delegates representing the marine craft met with the employers of marine labor. After many code drafts, one proved fairly acceptable and received the approval of labor and industry. A special Government board, appointed to examine the code, gave its approval. The President, however, refused to give his approval to this code and the whole matter was abandoned.

It was the failure to provide a maritime code that placed the maritime industry in a position where the Communist Party could step in and take over control.

LOCAL 38-79, INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION OF SAN FRANCISCO

For purposes of clarity, there will be attached to this brief a supplemental brief on the subject of Harry Bridges, now leader of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. The supplemental brief will carry the documentary evidence to substantiate that which we are to say in this brief.

As early as October 1922 Bridges had entered the riggers' and stevedores' union and attempted to gather about him a group of radical progressives. In

1924 he and a few others organized a longshoremen's local. They failed, however, to gather many men about them and the local soon fell to pieces.

This group continued to agitate along the water front until the year 1932 when they decided to again attempt to organize another longshoremen's local.

In order to do this, Equality Hall, at 141 Albion Street, San Francisco, Calif., was chosen as a meeting place for the new group. There Harry R. Bridges presided over the deliberations. The leading men chosen at these meetings were composed largely of the same group that had worked with Bridges prior to 1932. They were Henry Schmidt, Henry Schrimpf, Roger McKenna, Alvin Kullberg, William Christensen, J. D. White, John Delaney Shoemaker, Robert Boyce, John P. Olson, Otto Kleinmann, Ralph Mallen, Henry Morrissee, John Shaw, and Herman Mann, a brother-in-law of William Christensen. Not all the men named here were Communists, but when they had a meeting of the group, any who were found that were unwilling to work to try out the program were quickly eliminated.

At these meetings the outline of a rank-and-file control group was considered. Communist assistance was disclosed. We charge that as a main objective the Equality Hall group was to do everything to build up the prestige of Harry Bridges so that in due time he could be the Pacific coast leader in maritime affairs.

First, the time was set to oust Lee J. Holman, then president of the Longshoremen's Association of San Francisco, and elect a new set of officers who would take program from the Communist Party.

On the basis of agitation they proposed to demand a new increased wage scale, a 6-hour day, absolute control of the longshore-labor supply, control of the hiring hall for longshoremen, a Pacific coast federation into which all the elements of maritime labor could be inducted, so that Pacific coast control of transportation could be effected and from there an international federation for the whole of the United States.

We introduce herewith the file of the bulletin called Waterfront Worker, which we offer as exhibit No. 1.

This Waterfront Worker was presented to the men on the water front as a rank-and-file bulletin by the Equality Hall group. The attention of the committee is called to volume 1, No. 1, of January 1933. Please note that it is issued by "A group of longshoremen, with the cooperation of the Marine Workers' Industrial Union." The M. W. I. U. was an admittedly Communist Party union.

We further request the committee to read the banner on page 4, volume IV, No. 10, the issue of March 9, 1936. This says "Western Worker," which at that date was the official Communist Party newspaper for the Pacific coast. Undoubtedly the reason for this mistake was due to the fact that the Waterfront Worker was published at the same place as the Western Worker and by the same people.

We offer here a copy of Program Adopted at the State Communist Party Convention in San Francisco, November 24, 1935. This is an original as mimeographed for distribution by the party. We ask that it be marked "Exhibit No. 2."

Your attention is directed to the subheading "Rank-and-File Bulletins" from under which we quote:

'Below is a partial list of the Rank-and-File Bulletins now being issued by our party sections throughout the State, and including some of the more important national bulletins:

"San Francisco—Waterfront Worker (I. L. A.), box 1158; this box was taken in the name of Harry Gliksohn," which is the alias for Harry Jackson, now organizer for district 12, Communist Party, U. S. A., under the name of Morris Rapport."

At this time we introduce photostatic copies of letters written by Roy Hudson, now member of the central committee of the Communist Party of the United States and at the time of writing secretary of the Marine Workers' Industrial Union, to Harry Jackson at San Francisco, Calif., dated February 5, 1934, and February 8, 1934, respectively, and request that they be marked "Exhibits 2A and 2B."

We now quote in part from the letter of February 5, 1934:

"It sure was too bad that I did not have the material sent out by the I. L. A. before we went to Washington—especially the one containing the telegram to Ryan insisting upon their demands for a \$1 hour. If we had of had this one—or known about it—we would have presented it there and it would have been dynamite.

"Yes; I'm raising hell about no articles from you, and still don't think you can get out of it by passing the buck to Telford. You can write and the articles contained in the Waterfront Worker are god-damn good—and there is no reason why we can't get some for the Voice.

"In connection with the Northwest—the reports that I receive from there are fairly encouraging and some progress is to be recorded. I believe that now is a very opportune time for you to go up there. Not only will you be able to stimulate the work, but also will be able to clarify some problems that are developing there in regards to methods of work, etc. One thing that must be done is put the work inside the I. L. A. on a more definite oppositional basis, in the sense that it will function through the medium of the opposition group and not solely through the channels of our union."

This letter points out three things: First, that Harry Jackson was operating in San Francisco with the I. L. A. on behalf of the Communist Party in the Marine Workers' Industrial Union; secondly, in the second paragraph quoted it points out the contact between Sam Telford, known Communist Party member, and also the fact that Harry Jackson was writing articles for the Waterfront Worker; thirdly, it shows the connection with the Northwest, together with an order to Jackson to go to the Northwest, meaning Oregon and Washington. It is interesting to note that already in this brief the committee will find that the same Harry Jackson is now organizer to the twelfth district of the Communist Party, which comprises Oregon and Washington.

We now quote from the letter of February 8, 1934, in part:

"The news you write regarding the response of the Northwest to the convention is very good, and the rank and file delegation that went up certainly seems to indicate that our policies are getting root. I trust that we are consolidating a real firm opposition group. In view of the I. L. A. stand at the code hearings we certainly should be able to make headway all around—and should give an impetuous to the convention. There is little to add upon my previous remarks and the wire concerning the stand of the officials. * * * It is doubtful whether we will be able to get minutes of this hearing in view of my failure to pay the \$50 for the last one. * * * In case I do get them will shoot them right out. I agree with you that the place where the convention should be held should not become a breaking point—although it would be much more favorable if it were held in Frisco.

"Now, Harry, in connection with your statement on Mink. This statement will not be taken up in the fraction—and in my letter of the December 15 I told you that if you thought you must raise objections, it should be through the center.

"I want to make myself very clear on this—especially in view of your statement in the letter accompanying the statement. It is unfortunate that you don't keep carbon copies, so therefore I will quote from your letter to make myself clear. You state and we will not let anyone's petty politics take away from us capable forces, etc. * * * I refer to Stachel in particular."

"From this you frankly state that George is where he is because of 'some one's petty politics.' I have the utmost confidence in you, Jackson, and under no circumstances would I accuse you of factionalism; but frankly this is only speculating on decisions and trying to find factional reasons, or petty political reasons for them being made. We must not only reject petty politics, but we must just as severely reject tendencies that see petty politics in every decision.

"Again why were the reasons he went: (1) He proposed, very strongly himself; (2) an even greater insistence upon the party of Ray—who, when it looked like George might not go, raised particular hell. There were other factors, but these were the basic ones, and if there is any petty politics in them I will eat my hat.

"Now final reasons why your recommendation is not going to be raised in the fraction: (1) Recommendations came from top fraction—final decisions made by P. B.—and this year a stronger insistence that the candidates not become public property. Very few people know who they are—incidentally you should not have been informed—and I had hell raised with me already because people knew who shouldn't. Therefore, to raise it in the fraction would be incorrect; (2) fraction meetings—and Bureau have been held—and no one has raised any objections and agreed with the formal proposal for his temporary leave.

"I have other ideas on the whole subject, but I believe the above make it clear why I take the stand I do and I hope you will understand them and the spirit I make them—even though there might be some sharp criticism—I still

insist that the decision was a correct one and that you have no basis upon which to raise serious objections. However, if you are still of the same opinion, then you should and must raise them directly with the center. But under no circumstances is the question of where George is at to be raised with anyone on the coast."

Paragraph 1 shows the continued headway that the party was making in the I. L. A., and the rest of the portion quoted is a very clear exposition of the methods of the party and its functional operation.

In paragraph 11 the committee's attention is called to the words, "final decisions made by P. B." This is the political bureau of the central committee of the Communist Party.

The committee is requested at this time to call the witnesses designated in the list of witnesses appended to this brief, and to ask the witnesses the questions submitted in appendix B.

We now offer the book entitled "Men Who Lead Labor," written by Bruce Minton and John Stuart. We request that it be marked "Exhibit 3."

We also introduce the Communist-controlled magazine, New Masses, issue of May 3, 1938, as exhibit 4.

Exhibit 4 was purchased in the Communist Party book store, located at 226½ South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif., and the clerk admitted it to be a recognized Communist publication. On page 8 thereof we find that Bruce Minton is an editor of New Masses. He is further known to be a member of the Communist Party. On page 19 there is an article entitled "The Moscow Trials, a Statement by American Progressives." In the list of signers to this article we find the name of the coauthor of Men Who Lead Labor, John Stuart. He is also known to be a member of the Communist Party. This proof is offered to show that the authors of Men Who Lead Labor are Communist Party affiliates and that the articles therein represent the Communist Party position.

Attention is now called to the page of acknowledgments in exhibit 3, Men Who Lead Labor. We cite the two referred to from the Pacific coast; Lawrence Emery and Herbert Resner:

Lawrence Emery: Was arrested for industrial sabotage and sentenced to San Quentin Prison, State of California, from Imperial County. He admitted that he was a Communist and is now the educational director of Detroit district of the Communist Party.

Herbert Resner: Now secretary of the Tom Mooney defense committee, succeeding Arthur Kent. Both are members of the Communist Party. Resner is a member of the lawyer's unit of the professional section of the Communist Party in San Francisco.

It is from these two that much of the material on Harry Bridges, Voice of the Rank and File, an article in Men Who Lead Labor, is written.

In order to properly place the others acknowledged, we state as follows:

Louis Budenz: A member of the staff of the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, U. S. A. section, Communist International.

Theodore Draper: Coeditor of New Masses, a recognized Communist Party magazine.

Granville Hicks: Professor of Harvard University and an admitted Communist.

Robert W. Dunn: Head of the Labor Research Association and an admitted Communist.

Grace Hutchins: Member of Labor Research Association and an admitted Communist.

Hy Kravif: Member of Labor Research Association and an admitted Communist.

Our introduction of Men Who Lead Labor at this time is to quote from pages 180 and 181 thereof:

"In 1924 he (Bridges) and a few others organized a local * * * By 1932 conditions on the docks had become so bad that the small group of militants decided to launch a third attempt to build the I. L. A. The handful of "progressives" published a mimeographed, clumsily constructed little bulletin which they called the "Waterfront Worker."

"The Marine Workers Industrial Union, affiliated with the Trade Union Unity League, lent powerful aid to the agitation for organization."

We now offer a folio of eight dodgers as follows: Call for Unity Conference, June 25, 1933; Notice to All Longshoremen, October 8, 1933; Who Are the Communists? December 1933; How We Stand, December 1933; Mass Meeting, De-

ember 28, 1933; Workers' International Relief, March 5, 1934; Will Padgy Morris Dare? March 11, 1934; The Battle Rages, April 25, 1934, and request that the folio be marked "Exhibit 5."

These dodgers were issued by the Marine Workers' Industrial Union and other Communist organizations to assist Bridges and his "militant" group.

We contend that our exhibits, as publications of the Communists themselves, have proven:

1. That the Equality Hall group existed as charged.
2. That it commenced the agitation that brought about the San Francisco general strike and chaos to the maritime industry.
3. That it did its agitation by means of the Waterfront Worker and dodgers.
4. That it was headed by Harry Bridges.
5. That the Communist Party declares in exhibit 2, that Harry Bridges and his group who issued the Waterfront Worker were members of the waterfront section of the Communist Party.

6. That the Communist controlled Marine Workers Industrial Union was placed at Bridges' disposal and that he accepted and affiliated with their work.

We desire to point out that the men who were instrumental in working out the program at the Equality Hall meetings are, for the greater part, holding key positions at the present time in the Maritime Federation of the Pacific.

We shall at this time give a thumbnail sketch of the men as mentioned in the Equality Hall group:

Henry Schmidt: Schmidt is now the president of local 1-10, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, a C. I. O. affiliate. He has been a member of the Communist Party. Affiliation not known at the date of this report. He is a right-hand man of Mr. Bridges, a German naturalized citizen who is quiet, forceful, and competent. It is quite probable that Schmidt's advice to Bridges makes one of Bridges' effective means for advancement. Schmidt has control of the subject matter of the Waterfront Worker. He is married.

Henry Schrimpf: Schrimpf is a radical. He was formerly a member of the Communist Party. He is a citizen of the United States and was sent to the east-coast ports in order to build up sentiment for an international maritime federation. He has been a delegate to most of the maritime conventions and is important in the Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, the C. I. O. affiliate.

Rodger McKenna: McKenna is an old-time longshoreman, has no communistic leanings and did not agree to the Equality Hall program. As soon as this was discovered, he was side-tracked for any advancement. He is working as a longshoreman and is a member of the board of directors that publish the conservative Pacific Coast Longshoremen in opposition to the radical paper, the Voice of the Federation.

Alvin Kullberg: Kullberg was a former I. W. W. organizer. He was affiliated with the Communist leaders in the thirteenth Communist Party district of California. His wife was a teacher in the workers' school of the Communist Party. He was not given much advancement by the new radical crowd and is now a longshore boss on the waterfront.

William Christensen: Christensen is a Danish citizen. He is a seaman. He is also a brother-in-law of Herman Mann. He was a member of the board of trustees and is counted as a dependable member of the International Longshoremen's Association and the Communist Party.

J. G. White: White is known to the group as "Dirty Neck." He never has been prominent in the union, but he knows how to take orders and the rank-and-file take care of him.

John Delancy Schemaker: Schemaker is a former member of the hospital staff at the Palo Alto Veterans' Hospital. He was discharged for circulating radical literature. He was also a member of the Young Communist League. He had never been a longshoreman or been on the waterfront before the 1934 strike. He was a student of the Communist labor school. He is married and his wife is a sister of the former wife of Herbert Mills, who is now known as Olga Von de Boor. Both of these women are the daughters of Max Jublonsky, a San Francisco veteran of the Communist Party. Herbert Mills was at one time a Communist leader in the seamen's union. Schemaker has been arrested a number of times for assault and other charges due to labor agitation. He is now a member of the Communist Party and also a prominent leader in the International Longshoremen's Association.

Robert Boyce: Boyce is an old-time longshore winch driver. He was elected on the board of directors of the International Longshoremen's Association under the Holman regime. He would not subscribe to the Communist leadership and was side-tracked from higher authority.

John P. Olson: Olson is Swedish born, a seaman and a former organizer of Young Communist League. He was candidate for State senator on the Communist Party ticket in 1934. Olson was arrested on several occasions during the 1934 labor difficulties. He has been active in the Communistic Workers' School conducted by the Communist Party. He has also been active as organizer for the radical United Farmers' League, as well as in the new-pioneer movement, active in the recent labor troubles in the Grass Valley, Calif., mining district. He was a picket captain in the 1934 strike and is a very valuable cog in the Bridges organization.

Otto Kleinman: Kleinman is a member of the Communist Party and also of the International Longshoremen's Association. He is on the examining board that looks after new members to see if they are proper material for the Communist Party. He is very close to Harry Bridges.

Ralph Mallen: Mallen was publicity manager during the 1934 strike. He is not a Communist. He was, however, very close to Norma Perrie, who became secretary to Bridges and was under orders of the Communist Party. She was at one time the wife of Arthur Scott, otherwise known as Arthur Kent.

Henry Morrissee: Morrissee was born in Germany and was a member of the strike committee of the 1934 strike. He is a well-known Communist.

John D. Shaw: Shaw has been a candidate for office a number of times on the Communist Party ticket; is a well-known Communist. He never was a longshoreman, but was for a long time a member of the International Longshoremen's Association executive board under Harry Bridges. He is an officer of the Ornamental Iron Workers' Union. He is reported to be a member of district bureau, district thirteen of the Communist Party. It was this Communist group headed by Harry Bridges and directed by Sam Darcy, then head of the thirteenth Communist district, that started out to wrest control from the conservative longshoremen of the Pacific.

With the final granting of the charter to local 38-79 of the International Longshoremen's Association, this group offered Kullberg as a candidate for president against Lee J. Holman, representing the conservatives.

Holman won the election, and with him came Ivan Cox as secretary of the union.

The organization of I. L. A. 38-79 meant that there were two organizations of longshoremen on the water front. The "Blue Book" still had their contract with the shipowners.

Early 1934 found the I. L. A. Union and the shipowners at grips with each other.

The Equality Hall group, however, had not been content with the results of the election and commenced immediately a campaign against Mr. Holman. The Waterfront Worker, bulletins from the Marine Workers' Industrial Union, and editions of the Western Worker, official publication of the Communist Party on the Pacific coast, let loose a barrage of hate.

At this time we desire to offer the files for the years 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936, and 1937 of the Western Worker, with the request that these files be marked "Exhibit 6."

On April 19, 1934, it was announced that Lee J. Holman had been permanently suspended from the I. L. A. and that he would not be eligible for reelection to the presidency within a year. Holman was not present at the trial at which the suspension took place as he was at home suffering from an attack of pneumonia. The charges that were filed against Holman were that he was too conservative and that he did not represent the sentiment of the majority of the unions.

This driving of Lee Holman from the presidency of local 38-79 placed Harry Bridges and his Equality group in the driver's seat.

They immediately started an intensive drive to organize I. L. A. branches in every port of the Pacific coast. One of the first steps taken was to have Norma Perrie appointed as his private secretary. Norma Perrie was at that time a high-ranking member of the Communist Party and could be expected to report in detail concerning matters in the I. L. A. of interest to the Communist Party.

In Communist Party district No. 12 (Washington and Oregon, Harry Jackson, Wesley Randall, S. Sparks, Robert Thompson, Howard Scroggus, James

Carroll, Emil Miljuis, and Blacke Campeau were appointed to take charge of the maritime interests of the party. Likewise in Los Angeles, George Maurer, Dr. J. C. Coleman, Mary Crossman, Joe Simon, Leo Gallagher, and Harold Ashe were assigned to the same function for southern California. Thus Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego were furnished by the Communist Party with committees to effect the whole program of Communist control of marine transportation.

The first organization campaign put on by Bridges, working under the general theory of the N. I. R. A., soon obtained working capital for the new organization, through the per capita tax paid by the new members of the I. L. A. local. Joseph P. Ryan, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, was so pleased with the results that he appointed Harry Bridges as the Pacific-coast organizer.

The first step made to destroy the "Blue Book" unions was a demand made by Bridges and backed up by Ryan upon the Central Labor Council of San Francisco to cancel the affiliation of the "Blue Book" unions with the council.

William E. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, was forced to recognize a demand made by one of his national unions and so the "Blue Book" union was put out of the Central Labor Council, and Harry Bridges, Henry Schmidt, John Larsen, John D. Schomaker, William Christensen, Henry Schrimpf, Bjore Halling, Fred Knopp, and John Cronin were appointed as delegates to the Central Labor Council from the new I. L. A. 38-79.

It is important that the committee note that out of these nine delegates, five had been members of the Equality Hall group and that John Larsen and Bjore Halling became members later.

Bridges was also seated as the delegate to the State Federation of Labor convention.

Regardless of the formation of the International Longshoremen's Association Union 38-79, the "Blue Book" union still held a contract with the employers that was not to expire until December 1934. The employers felt that they could not break the contract with any justice to the "Blue Book" union. They stated that they would continue to carry out the contract during its life.

The I. L. A. then began its campaign to break this contract. The I. L. A. showed that under the N. I. R. A. they would receive the new contract at the expiration of the contract with the "Blue Book" union in December of 1934. They also served notice to the effect that if the "Blue Book" union did not apply for membership at once, the initiation fee would be raised to \$50 when the I. L. A. were in control and that the "Blue Book" union men would not be employed on the water front.

The weaker of them began to secretly take out the books of the I. L. A. and at the same time carry a book in the old "Blue Book" union. When the "Blue Book" delegates tried to collect fees they were put off for various reasons and the treasury of the "Blue Book" union began to run low.

These actions on the part of the I. L. A. and counter-actions on the part of the "Blue Book" union weakened the authority of the "Blue Book" union officers until they became afraid to take a decided stand and fight the I. L. A. in the open. In the meantime, the I. L. A. increased its membership and hundreds of Communists went on the rolls until the I. L. A. had about 3,000 men in the local. Many of these men were strangers on the water front and many of them had never been and were not longshoremen.

The I. L. A. then complained to the local N. I. R. A. board that they were being discriminated against by the "Blue Book" union and could not secure employment unless they joined that union. They stated that the "Blue Book" union was a company union and that the officers were paid by the employers, and that section 7 (a) of the N. I. R. A. Act was being violated.

George Creel, regional director of N. I. R. A., appointed a committee to hear the complaint of both sides. The committee decided that the "Blue Book" union was not a company union, but that the water front was open to workers regardless of labor union affiliations. This ruling meant that the employers would be forced to employ I. L. A. men in violation of their contract with the "Blue Book" union.

The first skirmish came on October 11, 1933, when the Matson Navigation Co. discharged four longshoremen because they refused to obey the orders of the pier superintendent. The I. L. A. demanded the immediate reinstatement of these men and on the refusal of the company, 150 men walked off the docks. The Matson Navigation Co. employed a new force of men and continued operations, but not without disorder.

A strike immediately threatened and the matter was referred to an arbitration board appointed by George Creel, consisting of Judge Max Sloss, Rev. Father Thomas F. Burke, and Henry Grady. After hearing the evidence, the board ordered the Matson Navigation Co. to return the four men to work. Because of this ruling the Matson Navigation Co. gave up its fight, discharged their new men, and reemployed all the strikers.

After winning this strike Bridges looked for more worlds to conquer, and on December 17, 1933, at a meeting in the buildings trade council gave consideration to calling a coastwise strike. This strike was to demand \$1 an hour, a 6-hour day, and a 30-hour week, sole union recognition and control of all hiring halls. The committee should note that this was not done by the "Blue Book" union with which the shipowners had a contract and were operating with, but by the Equality Hall group.

After this meeting a demand was sent to the Waterfront Employers Union to meet with the delegates of the I. L. A. to consider a Pacific coast contract with them. The employers refused to meet with the I. L. A. and stated that they had no authority to give a coastwise contract to anyone and that it was a matter for the various ports severally to decide. George Creel, district director for the N. I. R. A., insisted that the employers meet with the I. L. A.

A meeting was finally effected between the leaders of the I. L. A. and the Waterfront Employers Union on March 5, 1934, at which time the I. L. A. renewed their previous demands and in addition made a closed-shop demand for the entire Pacific coast. The employers refused this demand and stated that there was nothing in the N. I. R. A. that required an employer to give a closed-shop agreement to anyone.

On March 7 the I. L. A. sent out a strike call to see if all the locals on the coast would agree to a coastwise strike on March 23, 1934. The locals voted almost unanimously to call a strike.

At this time we offer in evidence the Communist Party publication, the Communist, issue of July 1934, volume 13, No. 7, and request that it be entered as exhibit No. 7.

This exhibit is offered as proof that the Communist Party plotted to break up the conservative longshore union and planned the development of a rank-and-file organization, unification of the whole Pacific coast, a strike of the Pacific coast, and finally a general strike.

This exhibit contains an article entitled "The Great West Coast Maritime Strike" by Sam Darcy, at that time head of the Communist Party in the State of California. We quote therefrom—please note that any comments appearing in parentheses within the quotation are ours and not those of the writer.

On page 664 we find: "In order more easily to study the development of this movement (by the Communist Party) we are dividing our subject into four main headings:

- "1. Problems in developing the movement for struggle.
- "2. Problems in the calling of the strike.
- "3. Problems in the conduct of the strike.
- "4. Perspectives for the outcome of the strike.

On page 665 we find: "At the end of 1932, at the initiative of the militant elements of the water front, agitation for the organization of a real worker's union began.

"This agitation centered chiefly around the publication of a mimeographed bulletin called 'The Waterfront Worker,' which had an average paid circulation of about 1,000 to 1,500 copies.

"In the group which published the Waterfront Worker were included a minority of Communists and other militant elements. The guiding line for this group was above all to develop a militant group of workers united with the objective of breaking the 'Blue Book' union and to establish a real union. At times there was criticism that the Waterfront Worker did not take a clearly enough militant stand on this or that policy. When this criticism was justified, it could in every instance be traced to the desire of the Communist elements in the group not to sacrifice the unity of the militant elements for a clearer formulation in minor questions. In other words, the group felt it was more important to attain the larger objective of developing a united militant group (not limited to Communists alone) than to refuse to make a concession to this or that backward idea amongst the workers."

On page 666: "About the middle of 1933 an initiative group was formed, which included all elements (also some militants from the Waterfront Worker) to establish a regular local of the I. L. A. The sentiment for the I. L. A. rapidly

developed. Yet there was some tendency among the Communists at that time to organize competitive M. W. I. U. recruiting. The I. L. A. movement was so overwhelming among the men, however, that it would have been suicide to take the handful of militants away from the general stream of the movement. The party, therefore, took a determined stand against it."

Also: "From the moment of organizing, a struggle began between the militant elements on the one hand who wanted action to: (1) Improved conditions; (2) Destroy the 'Blue Book'; (3) establish west coast unity of all longshoremen—and the reactionaries, on the other hand, who aimed to organize a typical A. F. of L. reactionary union. In the course of this fight between the reactionary and militant elements, the militant element succeeded in putting through a proposal to call an early west coast rank-and-file convention.

"This convention met in February 1934 and remained in session for about 10 days."

On page 667 we find: "There were also a number of directly political achievements at the convention. These included: (1) The adoption of a resolution against the loading of ships flying the Nazi flag; (2) the adoption of a proposal for a water-front federation which was a first step toward united action between longshoremen and other marine crafts, especially the seamen, and for gang committees, port conferences, etc.; (3) unemployment insurance; (4) against arbitration."

The committee's attention is called to the fact that the above quotation shows that the leadership was not alone interested in the development of the unity of the longshoremen of the Pacific coast, but in its first convention proceeded at once to adopt the major thesis of the Communist International against its greatest enemies, namely nazism and fascism.

Also on page 667 we find: "The San Francisco local had sent a very militant delegation. This delegation was the backbone and leadership of the militant sentiment in the convention."

When the decision to strike on May 23, 1934, was voted by the I. L. A., the President of the United States and the Secretary of Labor were appealed to by the Pacific coast representatives to aid in preventing this strike. The President appointed Charles A. Reynolds, president of the N. I. R. A. regional board at Seattle, Dr. Henry Grady, of San Francisco, and Dr. J. L. Leonard, of the regional board at Los Angeles as a board of arbitration.

The board commenced hearings on March 28 as the unions had agreed to withhold action until the board reported.

The employers offered a counter-proposal agreeing to accept the local I. L. A. as a collective bargaining agency of the port. They also suggested the same approach in other ports on the Pacific coast, thus permitting each port to handle its own affairs. They agreed to a joint hiring hall and that all matters of hiring and wages be subjected to collective bargaining.

The delegates accepted this proposal and when it was taken to the I. L. A. the proposal was deadlocked on the wage proposition and demands were made that the wage scale be the same for the whole Pacific coast. Dr. Grady made the comment that this demand was in violation of the agreement already entered into with the delegates.

Further hearings were held without success until the employers, becoming tired of the growing demands of the I. L. A., stated that if the latter would not come to an agreement further negotiations would end on May 7, 1934.

During all these hearings and negotiations, criticisms were made in the Communist papers against the shipowners. They stated that the shipowners did not want any agreement and were only trying to break up the I. L. A. unions.

May we again call the attention of the committee to quotations from exhibit No. 7, heretofore introduced.

This quotation from page 670: "A strike movement cannot stand still. It must either spread and grow in militancy, or recede. Realizing this, the militant element laid their plans for the period of activity following May 9. The first step was to get the seamen out in sympathy actions. The Marine Workers Industrial Union, even during the week previous to the calling of the strike, was already laying its plans for sympathetic actions. When the actual strike was called, the M. W. I. U. immediately began by calling meetings of ships' crews, and held conferences of ships' delegates. By May 12, a large conference of ships' delegates organized by the M. W. I. U., voted to go into sympathetic strike.

"The question of whether pushing the leadership of the strike committee as against the district executive board, was within the limits of union legality. This prevented the strike committee militants from taking aggressive action. After several discussions, the comrades were finally convinced by being given the example of the struggle between the Soviets and the constituent assembly in Russia in 1917, where, despite the legality of the constituent assembly and the unofficial character of the Soviets, all the life and problems of the people were centered in the Soviets, so that eventually in the course of struggle, the masses began to look to the Soviets for leadership out of their position and not to the constituent assembly. In the discussion (with the members of the district committee) it was brought out how, under the special circumstances which confronted us in this strike we could do the same thing by putting all questions of relief, defense, picketing, negotiations, etc., to the strike committee, how rapidly the workers would themselves forget the strictures of legality and would instead accept the strike committee as their leaders, at the same time preventing any effort of the district executive committee to interfere with it.

"They have succeeded in centering all the life of the strike into this strike committee, with the exception of negotiations. The failure to take over negotiation was paid for dearly in the weeks that followed. It was finally accomplished, however, on June 17, when Ryan and company were booed and hissed off the platform. In this way we have overcome the error previously committed through abiding by the limit of legality, and have raised the strike committee, which was composed of militant elements, to the position of the real leaders among the workers.

"Once the strike was under way we divided our tasks under three main headings: (1) To keep the men united and prevent splits which might result in isolating the militants; (2) to keep the militancy on a continually upward swing; (3) to prevent any sell-out, and to gain as much as possible for the men out of the strike."

During all this time Bridges had not been idle in other directions. Considerable infiltration of radicals into the Teamsters' Union had been accomplished. Bridges was permitted to address meetings in the Teamsters' Union and urge them to support the I. L. A.

Michael Casey, president of Teamsters' Local 85, urged his men to refrain from strike because, he said, if you do strike you will endanger the life of your contract with the employers. Bridges and his aides, however, had done their work well and the teamsters agreed to support Bridges. They refused to man the trucks while the strike lasted.

The same attitude was maintained in the entire bay area, and Dave Beck's teamsters in Seattle were in accord with the program. Thus the whole coast was tied up and produce congested the docks and warehouses in the several ports.

The remnants of the "Blue Book" union attempted to carry out the provisions of their contract. The shipowners had to abide by their side of the contract and provide employment for those who offered themselves from the "Blue Book" union.

The police were not very energetic and seemed to favor the striking unions until a riot happened in front of the Marine Service Bureau. In this riot two police officers were severely injured and the attitude of the police changed.

Chief Quinn drove all the strikers to the west side of the Embarcadero. Riots, disorder, and bloodshed were common incidents every day, and the waterfront was manned by increased quotas of policemen.

The attempt on the part of the Communist Party to have other unions go out in sympathy with the Maritime group met with great success. The boiler workers and machinists followed very shortly after the teamsters. * * * This group was followed by the Masters, Mates, and Pilots. Randolph Merriweather, a close friend and partisan of Bridges, took out the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, and finally the bargemen's local pulled off the men who were working on the tugs and barges in the bay. This brought ship movement to a standstill and cargoes had to be diverted to Los Angeles.

In Seattle riots were common and the gates to docks were battered down. In Portland a dead line was established beyond which neither the public, Government officials, or others were permitted to go without a pass signed by the strike leaders. Finally, seamen, firemen, cooks, and waiters followed the orders of their militant leaders, and they added to the gradually growing difficulties of the owners and operators of merchant ships.

With this growing sympathetic movement the seamen saw an opportunity to regain their lost labor prestige.

Bridges immediately seized upon this attitude of the seamen, and his lieutenants, together with him, used the slogan "An injury to one is an injury to all." This was the battle cry of the old I. W. W.

Bridges then declared that the strike would not end until all the marine crafts had secured recognition, increased wages, and closed-shop agreements.

It was in this manner that the third central idea of the Equality Hall group was effected. This was the idea of a Pacific Coast Maritime Federation into which all the marine crafts and other affiliated unions might be enrolled.

We now quote again from exhibit No. 7, The Communist.

On page 677 we find: "In the early stages of the strike, the International Labor Defense, the Workers International Relief, and the Western Worker all offered, unconditionally, to put their resources at the disposal of the strikers. * * * This made a very good impression and was accepted by the men. In some cases, as in connection with relief, there was some hesitation to accept the W. I. R., but we proceeded without official acceptance to feed the pickets, and the resulting favorable reaction made it possible for the W. I. R. openly to enter relief work on the water front.

"We found that the secret of developing the militancy of the strike was to keep the men active and doing something at all times. The danger spots were usually the week ends, when there was a special tendency to take the Sundays off. In order to counteract that, special activities besides picket lines, mass parades, meetings, and strike affairs were arranged. Strikers were continually sent to outlying areas, particularly where college students, or unemployed, might be recruited as scabs."

On page 682 we find: "The I. L. A. strike committee kept the Western Worker as its spokesman; we were able to fight down "red scare" against the Marine Workers Industrial Union among the seamen; and after a bitter fight, give it a place on the joint strike committee.

"When the men took certain militant actions, these comrades insisted that the district committee issue leaflets saying in effect: 'We told you to do so-and-so.' This would have been an excellent weapon in the hands of the ship-owners. The men were grateful that the 'reds' gave them help and leadership without bombast.

"The leadership of the strike in San Francisco by Communists and other militant elements is well known and accepted."

The whole Pacific coast was in an uproar. Business of every character was suffering great financial losses. Messages were sent to the President and to the Secretary of Labor urging that the President intervene in the strike.

On May 17, 1934, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Edward F. McGrady, came to San Francisco and conferred with the local N. I. R. A. board. This board had almost abandoned its efforts to bring about peace.

The attitude of the strikers was set forth by Ralph Mallen, publicity committee chairman of the I. L. A., and also a member of the "Equality" group heretofore mentioned. He stated, "There will be no end to this strike until the longshoremen receive \$1 per hour, \$1.50 overtime, a 6-hour day, 30-hour week, control of the hiring halls, and a closed-shop union recognition."

Secretary McGrady issued the following statement: "A strong radical element in the ranks of the longshoremen seem to want no strike settlement. I have observed that Communists, through direct action and by pleas made in widely circulated Communist newspapers, are trying to induce the strikers to remain out despite our efforts to arbitrate. The committee seems to be helpless to do anything with the men who are representing them, or to combat the radical elements in the I. L. A. unions."

On May 24, 1934, National President Joseph P. Ryan, of the I. L. A., came to San Francisco. He had heard of charges of Communist control of Pacific coast I. L. A. unions and was undoubtedly concerned as to whether these unions would give any consideration to their national officers.

Bridges gave them his answer when he stated, "Settlement of the strike by mere recognition may mean a lot to the national heads of the I. L. A. who get fat salaries, but the workers are going to hold out for nothing less than the closed shop."

It was at this time that an aroused citizenry stepped into the picture.

The congestion on the docks was assuming serious proportions. The docks were filled to overflowing with the cargoes destined for local merchants and for transportation to other parts of the world. The Industrial Association of

San Francisco, an organization composed of the main industries operating within San Francisco, looked with great concern at the situation as it developed. Merchants demanded that the congestion on the docks be alleviated and that they be given permission to obtain their freight.

The industrial association finally pointed out the absolute necessity for something to be done and suggested that it would break the congestion on the docks. Officials of the San Francisco city government urged the industrial association to put off the attempt to open the piers and permit more efforts to end the strike.

Delay followed delay. Demands were increased. Finally an organization known as the Atlas Draying Co. was organized and this concern began hauling freight from the piers on July 3, 1934.

The striking unions had made elaborate efforts to stop this effort. They massed their men near pier 38, where it was announced that the first truck would start. More than 600 men wearing Communist buttons, and aided by many others, were ready to meet the police officers.

As the trucks emerged from the pier the battle was on. The strikers had secured metal missiles from the surrounding dumps, as well as a full supply of brickbats and some firearms. To meet this critical situation the San Francisco police were supplied with gas and riot guns besides their regular equipment. The strikers attempted to halt the trucks, but without success. They then directed their attacks on the police force and many of the police were hurt. Then the police opened up their gas barrage, used their riot clubs with effect, and drove the strikers off the Embarcadero.

The committee will remember that from the evidence given in exhibit No. 7 the party had a definite sequence to develop, namely: First, agitation; second, organization; third, the strike; fourth, development of sympathy; and fifth and finally, the general strike. In our first brief concerning the ultimate aims and activities of the Communist Party we have proved that the general strike is the final step toward a national revolution.

The Equality Hall group had now passed through the first four stages and felt that it was time to develop a general strike.

On June 11, 1934, in the Western Worker (see exhibit No. 6-A), there appeared the following: "Following a parade of 5,000 from the waterfront to the Civic Center, 15,000 massed to cheer the speakers of all the striking marine unions yesterday and protest police brutality on the waterfront. The demonstration was a tremendous victory for the workers, as it was held despite last-minute efforts of the police department threatening not to give a permit. The parade was the best mobilization of all the striking workers yet accomplished during the strike. Headed by the I. L. A. section, the Marine Workers' Industrial Union, International Seamen's Union, Masters, Mates and Pilots, and sympathetic organizations followed." "The loudest applause and cheers were at the mention of the probability of a general strike in the city in support of the strikers. * * * The speakers were Harry Bridges, chairman of the strike committee; local president, Mr. Johnston; John Shoemaker, Henry Schrimpf, and Shaw, of the I. L. A. strike committee. Telford spoke for the Marine Workers' Industrial Union; Grady for the Masters, Mates and Pilots. * * * Henry Schmidt, of the I. L. A., was chairman."

On June 18, 1934, the same paper carried: "A letter to every local trade union in the bay cities for a general strike in support of the striking longshoremen and seamen is the most important new development in the coast strike now entering the sixth week."

Facing a general strike situation on June 16 Mayor Rossi called a conference. At this conference were Michael Casey, president of the teamsters' union; Dave Beek, of the same organization in Seattle; J. J. Finnegan, of the ships' clerks' union; W. J. Lewis of the Pacific coast I. L. A.; Joseph Ryan, international president of the I. L. A.; A. H. Petersen, of the Los Angeles local I. L. A.; John T. McLaughlin and John A. O'Connell, of the central labor council; Thomas G. Plant, president of the Waterfront Employers' Union; Albert E. Boynton and John F. Forbes, of the Industrial Association; Herman Phleger, attorney, Judge Charles Reynolds, and Dr. J. L. Leonard, of the N. I. R. A.; and Colbert Coldwell, of San Francisco.

This group came to a definite agreement in relation to a basis to end the strike. This agreement was ordered to be presented to the unions on June 19, 1934.

The Communist Party immediately issued a special bulletin stating: "Keep strike in rank-and-file hands." (See exhibit No. 6-A, Western Worker, issue of June 25, 1934, p. 1, containing reproduction of this bulletin.)

A general meeting under rank-and-file control called to decide upon the agreement reached at Mayor Rossi's conference turned down the proposal. At this meeting, a general strike committee of 60 members with Harry Bridges as chairman was set up. The issue of July 9, 1934, *Western Worker* states: "The result was overwhelmingly to give wholehearted approval to the committee headed by Harry Bridges." "Speed general strike action!"

The railroad line that carries the freight cars to and from the docks along the Embarcadero is known as the Belt Line Railroad and is owned and operated by the State of California. It was interfered with, the switches blocked, and the employees, all civil-service men, were threatened so that they began to be afraid to run the trains.

Governor Merriam sent his representative, Mr. A. R. Pidgeon, to Harry Bridges as chairman of the strike committee and asked him to keep his strikers away from the Belt Line Railroad. This Mr. Bridges emphatically refused to do. The rioting of July 3 and 5 became so serious that the Governor ordered in the first contingent of the National Guard to the water front on July 5.

The general strike was declared.

The White House was besieged with messages from the Pacific coast requesting the intervention of the President and the appointment of a Federal board of arbitration to end the strike.

The President appointed Archbishop Hanna, of the Catholic Church, Edward McGrady, Assistant Secretary of Labor, and O. K. Cushing, an eminent lawyer of San Francisco, as an arbitration board to mediate the strike.

Dr. Louis Bloch, former statistician of the California State Labor Board, was appointed secretary to the arbitration board. He had been pro-labor and was thought considerably in favor of the radical elements that were behind the strike. Dr. Louis Bloch has since been appointed to the new maritime board in Washington, D. C.

The attention of the committee is called to the fact that Dr. Bloch was a member of the professional unit of the Communist Party in San Francisco. (The committee is requested to call for designated witnesses from the list appended to this report to prove this fact.) He is now most active in Washington, D. C., in the cause for aid to the Spanish Loyalist Government through the American League for Peace and Democracy, and the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

The Arbitration Board appointed by the President appeared to be satisfactory to the employers, but was viewed with suspicion by Bridges and his organization. Bridges was opposed to arbitration in any event. It was finally agreed, however, by both the shipowners and the International Longshoremen's Association that unlimited authority would be given to the Board, and agreement was made by both to abide by whatever award the Arbitration Board made.

In the issue of July 16, 1934, the *Western Worker* (see exhibit No. 6-A), appeared the following: "The central committee of the Communist Party has issued an appeal to workers in all parts of the country for immediate action in support of the west coast strike with protests, solidarity action in all ports, and financial assistance."

On July 9, 1934, at the Eagles Hall, San Francisco, Calif., 1,600 men congregated to hear Roy Hudson, a member of the central committee of the Communist Party of the United States, state in part the following: "We must organize to fight the shipowners, the police, the militia, Rossi, Roosevelt. They are our enemies as we have learned through our struggles, through our deaths. If we are 'reds,' then, after yesterday, there are many more 'reds' on the water front."

With the commencement of the general strike the strike committee under the leadership of Harry Bridges, and through him the Communist Party, took command.

At this time there was operating at 501 Baker Street, San Francisco, a restaurant known as Pierre's Chateau. This restaurant was located on the first floor of a large old dwelling house. The basement was made over into a cocktail bar and clubroom. The second floor was occupied by individual eating rooms and one portion by living quarters.

Pierre's Chateau was operated by one Pierre Margolis. Margolis was the father of a high-ranking member in the Communist Party by the name of Arthur Kent. Kent was known in the party by the name of Arthur Scott. During this period Kent was married to Norma Perrie, the secretary of Harry Bridges.

The committee should remember that this Norma Perrie was also a high-ranking member of the Communist Party.

We charge that during the general strike the Communist Party appropriated Pierre's Chateau and used it as a strike headquarters.

That the meetings were held on the second floor in Arthur Kent and Norma Perrie's rooms.

That not only did the Communist Party use the second floor for all their work, but that the Communist Party made Pierre's Chateau feed them.

That Sam Darcy and all leading Communist Party members were daily and continuously at Pierre's Chateau meeting with water front strike leaders.

That Harry Bridges established his headquarters in these rooms for the period of the general strike.

That Harry Bridges had a direct telephone line between his rooms at Pierre's Chateau and the headquarters of the strike committee on the water front.

That Harry Bridges met here with the buro of the thirteenth district of the Communist Party and took orders from them.

That one Sam Goodwin (alias Sam Rukin) was a partner of Pierre Margolis and Arthur Kent at Pierre's Chateau during this period and that he, on the request of the party, wrote articles that were published in the Western Worker and in leaflets and pamphlets.

That Sam Goodwin also wrote a speech that Harry Bridges delivered at the San Francisco Civic Auditorium during the general strike.

That Bridges was told that the speech was written under party instructions and that all points therein were given to Bridges by the party and that therefore he would have to deliver the speech as it was under party orders.

That Bridges delivered the speech as ordered.

We desire to introduce at this time a statement of one Arthur Kent made in Beverly Hills, Calif., December 22, 1937, and request that it be marked "Exhibit 8." We quote therefrom as follows:

"During the general strike I attended a meeting at Cupertino, Calif., at the Beatrice Kincaid ranch, where a group of leaders of the Communist Party met with Earl Browder, national secretary of the Communist Party, for the purpose of discussing the matter of Communist policy in connection with the general strike.

"I frequently met with various leaders out at the beach below Fleishacker's pool. Among others with whom I met there were Darcy, Bridges, Walter Lambert, Schmidt, Schomaker, Schrimpf, 'One-eyed' Larson, and Mann, water front section organizer of the Communist Party. I would frequently bring one or two of these men out there in my car and meet the others. These were all meetings of the members of the Communist Party only, and the subject matters of the discussions were always matters in connection with the strategy of the strike."

We charge that at the meeting at the Cupertino ranch one Edwards, a party leader, whom almost no one knew, made a speech and that this Edwards was none other than William Pieck, who had come to this country from Germany as representative of the Comintern to give its directions regarding the handling of the general strike.

In substantiation of the above charges, we request that the committee call the following witnesses, the names of whom are attached to the brief (see appendix).

That careful preparations for the general strike had been made in advance were evidenced by the fact that the unions had stored up food to be distributed to their members. The strike committee announced several matters of great significance proving that they intended to take over all sections of government. These announcements were as follows:

1. Permits would be issued for the opening of 19 union restaurants scattered at very strategic locations in the city and that deliveries to these restaurants will be permitted. These restaurants would have to serve the total population of San Francisco.

2. That arrangements were being prepared for the establishment of food depots under the control of the unions, and that deliveries would shortly be undertaken to these depots.

3. That arrangements were being made by the strike committee for a special police force to patrol the streets and maintain order.

The strike committee sent a delegation to the United States Government, Presidio of San Francisco. Here they informed the commanding general of the Ninth Corps Area that they would give to the United States Government permits for the operation of Army trucks in the city of San Francisco.

The city of San Francisco and Bay area were paralyzed for a period of approximately 2½ days. The National Guard took a firm stand and put a stop to the embargo on food deliveries; they brought order on the water front, and an uprising on the part of the citizens of the Bay area brought the general strike to a close.

This did not end the strike, only the general strike.

We now introduce the pamphlet entitled "The Communist," volume 13, No. 8, issue of August 1934, and request that it be marked "Exhibit 9."

This magazine published monthly by the Communist Party of the United States of America carries in this issue an article entitled "In the Midst of Great Historic Battles."

We quote from page 741: "What do the present strikes, especially the general strike in San Francisco, show? In the first place, as was pointed out by the recently held meeting of the central committee of the Communist Party, higher forms of class action are being developed by the American proletariat. These higher forms are the mass character of strikes and the increasing resort to the weapon of the general strike."

Again on page 745: "In San Francisco the struggle was waged not only between the workers and shipowners but between the workers and the entire capitalist class and the capitalist state."

And on page 748: "The Communist Party played a very important role, first in the development of the maritime strike and in calling the general strike in San Francisco. The Communist Party developed a revolutionary opposition in the I. L. A., which soon established its influence over the majority of the workers."

On page 749 we find: "The party will utilize the lessons from these gigantic class battles to carry out the decisions of the thirteenth plenum of the E. C. C. I., namely that of tightening up the discipline and fighting fitness of every party organization and of every member of the party."

"The California district of the party began energetically to execute the policy of concentration on strategic places of decisive industries and developed revolutionary mass work inside the A. F. of L., not in words but in deeds.

"The California district has demonstrated in practice that it is possible to involve the A. F. of L. membership in strike struggles, though their unions are under the control of the reactionary leaders. The California district has shown that the party can establish its ideological leadership over the A. F. of L. members in spite of their leaders.

"The maritime strike has shown that revolutionary leadership in the A. F. of L. unions is established not through compromise and legalistic illusions but through relentless struggle against the misleaders and the establishment of independent leadership of the economic struggles of the workers."

We now introduce a folio containing the following dodgers:

"A. F. of L. Trade Unionists";

"Smash the Shipowners' Terror";

"Break the Shipowners' Dictatorship";

"Striking Workers";

"Forward to a General Strike";

"Workers' World, Mariners' Section";

"Guardsmen Are Not Scabs";

and request that this folio be marked "Exhibit 10."

These dodgers were all issued by the Communist Party and circulated on the water front. The last two bulletins were issued to the Regular Army and national guardsmen on the water front.

We now introduce the following photostatic copies of telegrams and request that they be marked exhibits numbered as indicated:

Exhibit 11, Sam Telford to Harry Jackson, May 15, 1934:

"I. S. U. voted strike over officials who tried except Dollar Oceanic Lines; this defeated. Offer united front, refused by officials. Can't attack A. F. L. now account delicate situation I. L. A. relations. Forming I. S. U. opposition, may win united front later. Ryan arrives soon. Danger negotiations. What's matter Seattle? No ships out. Tell Archer 60 recruited 1 day here."

Exhibit 12, E. B. O'Grady to J. J. Scully, June 17, 1934:

"Agreement arranged by Ryan completely deserts other organizations involved. All other organizations in joint meetings express same views. Have greatest opportunity now to win complete victory if this betrayal can be repudiated. Wire Ryan his desertion is condemned. His agreement destroys greatest and most uniform position ever arrived at among maritime unions.

Everything tied up as never before and no sign of weakening. Strength of striking unions increasing daily."

Exhibit 13, H. Jones to Harry Jackson, July 5, 1934:

"Sent following wire to united strike committee, your care: 'Since Ryan refuses, Marine Workers' Industrial Union has taken initiative to issue strike call to seamen, longshoremen all ports in support of west coast call issued in leaflet and press. Mass demonstrations planned to stop ships and protest against terror and use of troops. On to victory for all marine workers.'"

Exhibit 14, Charles Krumbein to general marine strike committee, July 7, 1934:

"We, 15,000 workers assembled July 6, 1934, at Madison Square Garden in New York City, send warmest fraternal greetings to all strikers in their heroic struggle for the right to organize, strike, and picket around your justified demands. Your militant struggle is a lesson for all workers on how to fight against the worsening conditions under the New Deal. We pledge ourselves to do all possible to extend the strike to the New York Port and to arouse a mighty protest movement against the Fascist terroristic use of the National Guard and the city police on the part of Governor Merriam and Mayor Rossi."

Attention of the committee is called to the fact that Charles Krumbein is a member of the central committee of the Communist Party, and that both the War Department and the Navy Department have information that Krumbein in 1934, 1935, and 1936 was the organizer under separate commission in the central committee of the Communist Party for agitation work by the armed forces of the United States.

Before we discuss the matter of Communist activities in the maritime industry after the general strike of 1934, we shall take up the matter of radical and Communist activities within the various unions that go to make up the crafts in the marine industry.

THE SEAMEN'S UNION OF THE PACIFIC

The Seamen's Union of the Pacific was organized in San Francisco many years ago.

There also existed the International Seamen's Union under the A. F. of L. This had a long life and the head of both organizations, the Seamen's Union of the Pacific and the International Seamen's Union, was Andrew Furuseth. Andrew Furuseth was a zealot for the seamen of the world and made a splendid contribution to their welfare during the many years of his activities. He was a loyal American, believing in keeping contractual relations, and emphatically opposed to radical influences in the labor organization under his direction.

After the World War of 1914-18 the shipping industry came into hard times as the many ships constructed for war purposes were on the hands of the Government and were laid up without anything for them to do. This condition brought about a determination of the United States Shipping Board to make a readjustment downward in wages. In this effort the private owners were in accord as they, too, had felt the pinch of the hard times.

Andrew Furuseth was opposed to any reduction in wages, and as he had built up the International Seamen's Union until he had some 67,000 members and about a million dollars in its treasury he determined to resist the Shipping Board and private owners by striking.

On May 6, 1921, a strike was called which lasted but a short time, with the striking unions in the International Seamen's Union going back to work at the wage scale fixed by the Shipping Board. This strike practically wrecked the International Seamen's Union and they did not get back into the merchant marine picture until the marine strike of 1934.

It was during this period 1921-34 that the Seamen's Union of the Pacific got into the hands of radicals. One Vance Thompson became their leader and the publication of the Seamen's Union of the Pacific, namely, The Seamen's Journal, became an advocate of the subversive policy of the Industrial Workers of the World.

Andrew Furuseth battled against this and eventually rescued his beloved union out of the hands of radicals. He once more started to rebuild the Sailors' Union of the Pacific and the International Seamen's Union. He never, however, regained his lost prestige and the shipowners on both coasts set up their own employing agencies as did also the United States Shipping Board.

The two unions continued their organizations on both coasts with diminished membership.

In 1924 the Marine Workers' Industrial Union, commonly known as the M. W. I. U., was organized by Roy Hudson. Roy Hudson was a member, and is now a member of the Communist Party of the United States of America. He is a member of the Communist Party's national central committee.

The Communist Party conceived the idea that it could create its own union in the marine field because the International Seamen's Union was under a cloud and that it was a good idea to bore from within the international and build up a strong seamen's union that might in time dominate the field.

We have already shown the influence and the position taken by the Marine Workers' Industrial Union in the events leading up to, and during, the general strike in San Francisco in 1934.

In 1935 Roy Hudson wrote to Victor Olander, then secretary-treasurer of the International Seamen's Union, and suggested that an amalgamation take place.

Both Andrew Furuseth and Olander, being bitterly opposed to communism, refused the offer of Hudson with some considerable heat. Hudson then came to the Pacific coast and got in touch with Elmer "Pop" Hanoff, then acting head of the thirteenth Communist district in California. He proposed that the thirteenth district aid Hudson in infiltrating the Sailors' Union of the Pacific with Marine Workers' Industrial Union members until they had sufficient members to overthrow the Sailors' Union of the Pacific and take it over.

Hanoff agreed to help and detailed Harry Jackson, alias Gliksohn, alias Rapport, Sam Telford, and others to work with the Communist members in the International Longshoremen's Association.

Both Harry Jackson and Sam Telford are admitted members of the Communist Party of the United States of America.

That their efforts were successful will be shown in the following paragraphs.

Prior to the entrance of the Communist Party into the picture the seamen had concerned themselves with wages and working conditions, the three-watch system, and alien employment.

In general, the seamen were loyal to the traditions of the sea, and when they had a contract with the shipowners they kept it. As they understood that ship's discipline was essential to safe operation, there were few complaints from the shipowners in these particulars.

The infiltration of 1933 and 1934 of the Marine Workers' Industrial Union into the seamen's group, as proven heretofore, had reached such a point in 1934 that when the maritime strike was called the seamen joined with the longshoremen and made demands for complete union recognition, the three-watch system, and an increased wage scale. They were also bitter against the employers' hiring halls, especially against the marine service bureau at Los Angeles and San Francisco. After they had received the award from the Hanna Board they took a great deal of pleasure in publicly burning the employers' service books that they were required to carry for a long time in order to secure employment. This burning took place in a vacant lot July 30, 1934, and Andrew Furuseth, then on the Pacific coast, watched the "funeral pyre" of the hated books with much satisfaction.

While on the coast, Andrew Furuseth talked to his men as often as he could to warn them against communism and the Communist Party. So many men had infiltrated the union from the M. W. I. U. that while at first they looked to Andrew Furuseth, they later became insulting and abusive to the old warrior, so that he had to stop talking to members of the union he had organized and fostered through many years of strife as well as success.

The failure of Roy Hudson to secure the assent of Mr. Olander to an amalgamation between the Marine Workers' Industrial Union and the Sailors' Union of the Pacific caused Hudson to send the copies of the correspondence between himself and Olander and Hanoff, acting head of the thirteenth Communist district, to members of the Marine Workers' Industrial Union, directing them to join the International Seamen's Union. Hanoff and Hudson also took up the matter with Harry Bridges, president of the local I. L. A., and asked his assistance.

As part of the program to control the merchant marine Bridges had to control the seagoing craft, so he and John Tillman, Sam Telford, Harry Jackson, and others started a Communist attack.

The committee should take cognizance of the fact that at an I. L. A. meeting, Henry Schmidt, member of the Communist Party and now president of the I. L. A., or now the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, made a motion that the International Seamen's Union admit the members of the Marine Workers' Industrial Union without the payment of an initiation fee.

When presented at the next International Seamen's Union meeting this motion was presented and carried and the International Seamen's Union came under the control of the Communist Party, that was also controlling the organization on the Pacific coast dominated by Bridges.

At this time we ask that the committee call the witnesses in list appended to this report in substantiation of the above.

A short time after the Marine Workers' Industrial Union members were admitted to the I. S. U. without the payment of an initiation fee, George Larson, assistant secretary to Andrew Furuseth in the International Seamen's Union, was replaced by Herbert Mills, a member of the Communist Party. Mills later became chief dispatcher of the International Seamen's Union, and the following group composed the radical leadership in the International Seamen's Union:

Charles Cates, John Tillman, Sam Telford, Jewel Hansen, Austen Hansen, Ernest Fox, Nils S. Larsen, L. E. Usinger, Peter Petersen, James Carroll, Bill Cave, "Blackie" Campeau, Fred Jones, Emil Miljuis, David Sanders, Howard Scroggins, Al Jones, Millard Smith, Robert Thompson, J. S. Morgan, Antone Paulovitch.

These became the leaders in the International Seamen's Union, and after they had taken over the organization they proceeded to take the Maritime Hall in San Francisco and another piece of real property in San Pedro and the money in several banks that was owned by the old International Seamen's Union. The International Seamen's Union tried to enjoin this new group from taking over their property. When, however, the charter of the union was revoked because it had joined the Pacific Coast Maritime Federation, the injunction was withdrawn because the men thought that they could get the union back into the I. S. U. under a new charter. The result of this was that Maritime Workers' Industrial Union not only stole the organization, but also its property and funds.

We will show the committee in the testimony of witnesses that the majority of the group named above were members of the Communist Party or an affiliate.

On March 22, 1935, Harry Bridges, together with Alvin Kulberg, Henry Schmidt, George Wolff, Ivan Cox, and Pete Garcia, all members of the I. L. A. and the Communist Party and delegates to the Labor Council, demanded that Paul Scharrenberg be dismissed from the Labor Council. This effort did not meet with success; but on June 12, 1935, at a meeting of the International Seamen's Union Local, Scharrenberg was ousted from the International Seamen's Union.

In order to keep control of the seamen's union group, Bridges had to keep enough men on shore. He did this by giving the seamen "work permits" in the International Longshoremen's Association.

We point out that this, of course, was in violation of the provisions of the board award as heretofore mentioned.

During the greater portion of this period, one Harry O. Lundeborg was the president of the Pacific Coast District Maritime Federation. It was during the presidency of Lundeborg that the International Seamen's Union revoked the charter of the local International Seamen's Union of San Francisco. Efforts were made to take the International Seamen's Union local back into the international affiliation, as the radical elements of the union wanted the Sailors' Union of the Pacific as an affiliation of the American Federation of Labor.

Lundeborg, however, began to flirt with the Committee of Industrial Organization and tried to bargain with the A. F. of L. to see which one would offer the best terms. Lundeborg had frequent clashes with Harry Bridges. He resented the order of Bridges to call out the seamen through the agency of the Maritime Federation. Lundeborg demanded control of the seamen and wanted the last word in any strike activity. To give Lundeborg the last word would have weakened the authority of Bridges, so the war between these two men increased with intensity.

Early in 1936, Ivan Hunter, then secretary-treasurer of the International Seamen's Union, wrote to Lundeborg and offered to restore the charter to date March 31, 1936. He offered local autonomy, but insisted that the Sailors' Union of the Pacific obey the orders of the International Seamen's Union executive board and the constitution of the International Seamen's Union. This meant that they had to leave the Maritime Federation of the Pacific.

The Sailors' Union of the Pacific replied in an open letter to Hunter, refusing as follows:

"We will not accept you or the I. S. U. executive board at your face value. Let your friends do that, but the S. U. P. will not. We will take back the charter under the terms which will protect the rank and file of the sailors' union. Brother members of the Maritime Federation, whom are you with? The members of the S. U. P. who fought with you on the 1934 picket lines, who backed the B. C. Longshoremen, who backed the lumber workers in their struggle last year, who backed the Juneau miners, the Gulf longshoremen, who backed all workers in trouble to a man? Or are you with the Scharrenberg machine and the executive board, who tried to break up the S. U. P. who are on record against the maritime federation and the following group of active rank-and-file members, all of whom were on the 1934 strike picket lines?" The letter was signed by Joseph Voltero, H. J. Vincent, Austen Hansen, Charles Russell, Edward Schieker, Herman Bach, R. L. Cherbourg, Harry Lundeborg, Ernest Grandt, E. R. Stowell, J. Crooks, S. Sorensen, A. J. Probert, J. P. Stuart, Carl Tillman, Charles Cates, Paul McDonough, and William Wallace.

This letter ended for a time any effort on the part of the International Seamen's Union to get the Sailors' Union of the Pacific back into the international. As time went on, however, and the fight between Bridges and Lundeborg increased, the Sailors' Union of the Pacific left the maritime federation.

At present the Sailors' Union of the Pacific has agreed to go back into the American Federation of Labor. That means that it will accept a charter from the International Seamen's Union.

We point out to the committee that when this charter is finally granted extensive effort will be made by the Sailors' Union of the Pacific to fight the Bridges-controlled maritime federation and also the Committee for Industrial Organization's seamen's union on the Atlantic seaboard.

FIREMEN, OILERS, AND WATER TENDERS

One of the most important links in the chain of unions to be taken over by Bridges and his "Equality" group was the marine firemen's, oilers', watertenders' and wipers' union. This union had been for many years an affiliate of the International Seamen's Union.

The Communists used the same method of procedure as always. They first infiltrated radicals into the union and then replaced the old leaders by new men.

John T. McGovern, a union leader who had been business manager of this union for many years, was replaced by one Earl King. King was a Canadian by birth, but eventually became a naturalized citizen of the United States.

King was on familiar terms with all local Communist Party members in San Francisco. He openly supported Communist Party members in the city and State elections. He was a close confidant of Lawrence Ross, who was editor of the Western Worker.

Earl King, Harry Bridges, and Randolph Merriweather, business manager of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, were the three radicals that comprised the most dangerous group on the San Francisco water front.

Their satellites were Claude Britt, the Honolulu representative of the union; Myron Coffin, the Seattle representative; George Boyle, Wayne Beeson, C. Chertman, "Blackie" Campeau, Ed. Davis, Joseph W. Dowdy, Jack Dalton, Ben Drysdale, John Ferguson, "Tiny" Ferrin, George Gay, Frank Hawley, and Ben Nelson.

King, Dalton, and Merriweather provided a bunch of sluggers that had no limits in devilry. Those men were always available to be sent away to do some job of intimidation and violence. A berth on shipboard was always ready for any of these men to make a get-away after they had committed some crime.

This group maintained headquarters in the New Occidental Hotel in San Francisco. The manager of the hotel was James Pope, and his son was a confidential clerk to Harry Bridges.

It was this group that threatened and intimidated engineers and nonlicensed personnel who refused to join the union.

There was close cooperation between marine firemen, the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, and the Communist Party.

At this time we notify the committee that witnesses from the list appended to this report will be put on the stand to prove the assertions regarding the activities within the firemen's, oilers', and watertenders' union.

On April 24, 1936, indictments were returned against three members by the San Francisco grand jury on the charge of criminal libel.

These were Earl King, secretary of the Marine Firemen, Oilers', Watertenders', and Wipers' Union, and A. M. Murphy, assistant to Harry Lundeborg, secretary of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, and James Neill, alias Walter O'Neill.

We introduce to the committee at this time a clipping from a San Francisco newspaper, April 29, 1936, entitled "Three Indicted in Union Murder Conspiracy" and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 16."

We quote from this exhibit: "That the entire Hunter case was framed by King, Bridges, et al., in the hope of obtaining newspaper publicity that would discredit Mr. Hunter and the International Seamen's Union was clearly brought out in court and has been made even more evident since the grand jury investigation."

In September 1936 a more sinister plot came to light, the same Earl King, and E. H. Ramsey, George Wallace, Frank J. Conner, and Ben Sackowitz were indicted by the Alameda County grand jury and held to answer on charges of first degree murder for the murder of George W. Alberts, chief engineer of the *S. S. Point Lobos*.

We introduce at this time clippings from a San Francisco newspaper dated September 12, 1936, and request that they be marked "Exhibit No. 17."

We now quote from a statement made by one of the defendants, Frank J. Conner: "The killing of Alberts was not the work of legitimate union men, but of Communists in the ranks of labor. Legitimate union men do not believe in 'beef squads' and don't want them."

"The Alberts murder was the work of a handful of Communists who were trying to ruin the Marine Firemen, Oilers', Watertenders', and Wipers' Association, which is one of the finest organizations in the country."

"I am not a Communist and I don't want to associate with them. They are not interested in better wages or better conditions for seamen. They are only interested in constant turmoil."

"One Communist on a ship will get the whole crew down. I would leave any ship that had more than two of them aboard, because it would mean just continual trouble for everyone during the entire cruise. Even though there are only a few Communists aboard, those who oppose them are likely to get their heads knocked off when they go ashore."

That which has followed since the conviction of these murderers is of equal interest to the committee.

George Alberts was killed, leaving a wife and three small children, in order to terrorize other men who refused to obey the demands of the Communist radical leaders. Since the murder, a so-called defense committee has continued to solicit funds to aid these four criminals and provide them with comforts while in prison.

King, while occupying a felon's cell, has been regularly elected as honorary president of the Firemen's, Oilers', and Watertenders' Union. The red line of communism is shown in this entire case.

King was a member of the Communist Party, as well as Sackowitz. Ramsey and Murphy took Wallace to George Wolff, a member of the Communist Party, who in turn took them to Lawrence Ross, then editor of the *Western Worker*, to arrange for a passport to either Mexico or Russia. Sackowitz, being a member of the party, was gotten out of town. He reported to the Communist Party in New York, where he was last heard from and probably secured through that agency a passport to Russia. The attorney who was hired to defend this group was George Anderson, a ranking member of the Communist Party.

This murder was but one of a series of either murders or attempted murders of licensed or unlicensed personnel. For the benefit of the committee we shall cite a few of them.

At this time we offer in evidence photostatic copy of note sent to strike committee, Marine Workers' Industrial Union, by Carl Lynch, secretary of strike committee, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 18."

In the original, in caps, "He is not to be permitted to return to that shift," is typed in red. It is interesting to note that Captain Silvers did not return to the ship.

Otto Blaczensky: He was deck engineer of the steamship *Minnesotan*. He was urged to join the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association and refused. On October 22, 1936, while the *Minnesotan* was lying at pier 28, he had his throat

cut and his body thrown into the bay. No arrests have ever been made in his case.

William V. McConologue: He was assistant engineer on the steamship *Cotton-eva*. His body was found floating in the bay in November 1936.

Raoul Louis Cherbourg: On August 2, 1936, Cherbourg's body was found in the bay near the San Mateo-Hayward Bridge. His nude body, wrapped in chains and wire, gave mute evidence of the manner of his death. This man was a friend of Harry Lundeberg's, and it was felt that he had important information to reveal to Lundeberg.

We offer at this time the picture of Cherbourg's body, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 19."

Carl Tillman, a member of the seamen's union and a friend of Cherbourg's, had received a telephone call from him stating that he had some information. A meeting place was arranged for, but the man met his death before the meeting took place. The seamen's union offered a reward of \$500 for the arrest and conviction of those who committed this crime, but no arrest has taken place in his case to date.

Frank G. Hussey: He was chief engineer of the steamship *Shelton* and incurred the displeasure of certain union leaders. His dead body was taken out of the bay in San Pedro, Calif.

Charles Arnold, the assistant engineer of the Dollar Line steamship *President Polk*, while at sea in October 7, 1935, was assaulted by Eugene Paton, now president of the warehousemen's union in San Francisco, and by Thomas Sharp. He was attacked in his stateroom.

We desire to introduce at this time a copy of that portion of the log of the steamship *President Polk* dated October 7, 1935, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 20."

John Hogan: He was patrolman of the International Longshoremen's Association, and on or about March 27, 1937, he talked with friends while he was on his way to have a little family party with his wife and child. Hogan never arrived home and has never been heard of since.

Hogan was very much against the Communist element in the International Longshoremen's Association and made no attempt to keep silent on the subject. Because of his outspoken tactics many complaints were made to higher I. L. A. officials.

Robert Hilker: He was deck engineer of the steamship *Helen Whittier*, which was strike-bound in Honolulu in April 1936. He was forced to leave the ship for fear of foul play. He had opposed the tying up of the vessel. The day he was last seen he told the dock watchman that he was leaving the ship, because "if I sail with that gang, you will be picking me up out of the bay." Three days later his battered body was recovered from the bay.

G. Mott: He was third engineer of the steamship *Golden Star*. Mr. Mott had an excellent service record with the American Hawaiian Steamship Co. and was known as a conservative labor man. His body was recovered from the Bay of Kobe Harbor, Japan, April 10, 1936.

K. H. Schwartz: On January 11, 1935, Schwartz was serving as a second assistant engineer on the steamship *Point Clear*, and the crew refused to work the vessel because Mr. Schwartz refused to join the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association.

On June 28, having been transferred to the steamship *Judith*, Schwartz was assaulted and stabbed by P. F. Flanagan, a member of the crew, while Schwartz was eating a meal.

We request that the committee pay particular attention to the matter of R. L. Cherbourg, as it will be brought up again in another brief.

The Marine Firemen's, Oilers', and Watertenders' and Wipers' Union still hold their membership in the Maritime Federation.

THE MARINE COOKS' ASSOCIATION

The Marine Cooks' and Stewards' Association had been for many years an affiliate of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific and the International Seamen's Union. Eugene F. Burke was the secretary of this association.

The Communist Party made sufficient infiltration into the cooks' and stewards' union to make Burke take orders from them when he tried to jump over the traces.

In defiance of the rules and laws of the International Seamen's Union he took his organization into the Maritime Federation of the Pacific and obeyed the program that Bridges set up.

When Ivan Hunter wrote to the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, inviting them to come back into the International Seamen's Union, Burke wired the Maritime Federation that his organization backed the stand of the S. U. P. and would not join the international except on the terms that the sailors set up.

This position placed Bridges in command, through the Maritime Federation, of the cooks and stewards, and they did their share of strike activities in violation of the various awards that had been signed by both parties.

At the present time the situation is that the Marine Cooks' and Stewards' Association has gone over to Harry Lundeborg, and when the Sailors' Union of the Pacific goes into the American Federation of Labor it is likely that they will follow the Lundeborg lead.

THE BAY AND RIVER BARGEMEN'S UNION

This union had for its business manager Ted Starr, and although he frequently takes issue with Bridges on matters of policy, it is to be noted that he took his union into the maritime federation. Thus the bay and river men made an added link to the chain controlled by the federation.

THE DOCK CLERKS' UNION

During the life of this union many jurisdictional disputes have taken place between it and the railroad clerks.

J. J. Finnegan was formerly business manager and is a conservative.

During the 1934 strike he tried to bring about peace and was one of the delegates that agreed with Joseph Ryan, Mike Casey, Dave Beck, and the citizens' committee to end the strike. Because of this action he was dropped from his position.

Harry Esty became president, and S. F. Bode, George A. White, and H. Stuyvulaer took over this union.

This union also came into the maritime federation and organized branches in the several ports of the Pacific coast.

At the present time they appear to have broken with Harry Bridges. The new officials, in opposition to the Bridges group, refused to let him or the maritime federation have anything to do with the new contract that they negotiated with the water-front employers, but they are still members of the maritime federation and no doubt everything will be done to patch up the present disagreement.

THE FERRYBOATMEN'S UNION

The ferryboatmen's union has never been a radical union and its members have been generally old seamen who were employed on the local ferries connecting San Francisco with points on the San Francisco Bay.

Until 1936 they were members of the International Seamen's Union, but in 1936 the charter was suspended because they affiliated with the maritime federation. Charles W. Deal was the business manager of this union, and it is to be remembered that he aided Albert Kullberg in circulating the first petition for a charter for a new longshoremen's union that was finally chartered by Joseph C. Ryan as I. L. A., 38-79.

During the general strike of 1934 Deal called off the men from the local ferries, preventing thousands of commuting residents from getting to San Francisco during the 3-day general tie-up.

When John L. Lewis of the C. I. O. gave Bridges control of the Pacific coast, Deal went along with the C. I. O. and the Bridges control.

SHIP SCALERS' UNION

Prior to Communist infiltration this union has been a rather humble organization and never got into trouble. The men were satisfied with their jobs and their employment.

Infiltration commenced prior to 1934, and the conservative men began to notice that their authority was being questioned.

On September 23, 1935, the Communists made up their minds to take over the union and brought their beef squad to the headquarters of the union at 32 Clay Street.

A serious riot took place in which Vincent Torres was killed and Alva Du Mond, head of the unemployment movement of the Communist Party, was severely stabbed, as was Soren Sorenson, a prominent member of the I. L. A.

George Wolff and Archie Brown, both members of the Communist Party, together with three others, were arrested and charged with murder.

This case was finally dismissed, as the police declared it to be just another water-front riot with insufficient evidence.

Archie Brown is an active member of the Communist Party. He has been arrested many times. He was candidate for the State assembly on the Communist Party ticket. He has acted as a personal bodyguard of Harry Bridges.

We point out to the committee at this time that we have mentioned Archie Brown in particular because he is neither a longshoreman nor a ship scaler and had no business at the meeting at which the riot took place except to help in taking the union away from the conservative membership. He was there purely as a member of the Communist Party to see that the dicta of the Communists were carried out by George Wolff.

The Communist Party effected control of the ship scalers' union. George Wolff became president; Pete Garcia, vice president; and Mary Sandoval became secretary.

Pete Garcia was a member of the I. L. A., editor of a radical Mexican newspaper, and member of the Communist Party. He was active in trying to have Paul Scharrenberg dropped out of the I. S. U., the Central Labor Council, and the State federation of labor. As Garcia had been active in organizing the I. L. A., he received his reward by being elected vice president of the ship scalers' union.

The most flagrant of all of the acts of the Communist Party was the induction of George Wolff into the marine union leadership. Wolff has no record as ever having worked alongshore in San Francisco in any capacity. He has a gift of speech and some degree of education. He was recruited for the International Longshoremen's Association from a Mission Street "hash house" and his first job was to be placed on the labor relations committee of the International Longshoremen's Association in San Francisco. Wolff next organized the dock stewards and then proceeded to order the slowing up of work and a change in working rules on the dock in violation of the awards.

He then became president of the Ship Scalers' Union, president of the Communist Sports Club, and was active in all Communist gatherings supporting the Communist Party ticket. Wolff has also been chairman of many reception committees to ranking members of the Communist Party, of which he also is a very high member.

He is now the president of the Alaska Fishermen's Union and is looking for new worlds to conquer.

It is perhaps needless for us to here point out that the Ship Scalers' Union also affiliated with the Maritime Federation when George Wolff became its president.

THE AMERICAN RADIO TELEGRAPHERS' ASSOCIATION

The American Radio Telegraphers' Association was another of the unions that joined the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. We will not discuss it in this brief, as we intend to present a separate brief on communications and the infiltration of Communists into the handling of communications.

LOCAL 68 OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS

This union had been an American Federation of Labor affiliate, but its charter was taken away when it affiliated with the Maritime Federation of the Pacific.

Peter Isaac is president; Harry Hook, business agent; T. W. Howard, secretary; E. F. Dillon, recording secretary.

Harry Hook is a member of the Communist Party. He was on the 1934 strike committee under Harry Bridges. He is at present an officer in the Maritime Federation and is active in C. I. O. circles.

THE MASTERS, MATES, AND PILOTS' ASSOCIATION

This organization was long affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The San Francisco local was headed, during the 1934 strike, by George Charlot as president, Capt. E. V. O'Grady, secretary and business manager, and C. F. May, as secretary-treasurer.

O'Grady, the secretary and business manager, practically ran the union. O'Grady was an old-time Communist and was active in organizing the Maritime Federation. O'Grady and Roy Pyle of the A. R. T. A. worked with Sam Darcy, then the head of the thirteenth Communist district in electing H. Lundeborg as the first president of the Maritime Federation.

Charges were brought against George Charlot that he had taken photostat copies of certain official communications and he was deposed as president, being succeeded by Capt. O. R. Rolstad.

O'Grady became too active in Communist circles and therefore lost his position as business manager of the M. M. and P. He was then appointed as regional director of the Committee for Industrial Organization of Portland, Oreg.

The Masters, Mates, and Pilots' Union have now severed their affiliation with the Maritime Federation. They did not join the C. I. O.

MARINE ENGINEERS' BENEFICIAL ASSOCIATION, LOCAL 197

This local is officered by J. E. O'Brien as president, John Dever and A. Mehle as vice presidents, and Randolph Merriweather as secretary-treasurer and business manager. The officers are figure heads and Merriweather runs the union.

Merriweather was in close harmony with Bridges, Earl King, and other radicals and joined the Maritime Federation.

While Merriweather is not recorded as a Communist, nevertheless, he worked with Communist leaders and with radical leaders and was active in the 1934 and other maritime strikes.

We have now presented to the committee the roster of the unions joining the Maritime Federation. We have tried to give the picture of the Communist thread running back and forth through these unions as their warp and woof. We shall now show to the committee by what means the federation was accomplished.

In February 1935 Harry Bridgés, Henry Schmidt, Henry Schrimpf, and Alvin Kullberg, all members of the Equality Hall group, had themselves appointed delegates from I. L. A., 38-79, to a convention to arrange for organizing the Pacific-coast federation.

This effort was backed by the Communists of the twelfth and thirteenth districts. Bridges appointed himself, Roy Pyle of the A. R. T. A. and Captain Lawberg of the Masters, Mates, and Pilots' Union as a committee on bylaws. In May 1935, at an I. L. A. district convention held in Portland, William Christensen, Emmet Harris, Fred Heiner, Otto Kleinman, John Montacelli, William Owens, John Olson, Henry Schmidt, Henry Schrimpf, John D. Shaw, and Elmer Wheeler were elected delegates to attend a meeting of organization for a maritime federation.

The attention of the committee is directed to the fact that all these men were original "Equality Hall members and all members of the Communist Party and every move they made was reported to the thirteenth Communist district.

The federation was finally formed and H. O. Lundeborg, of the S. U. P., and S. M. Kelly, of the firemen's, oilers, water tenders, and wipers' union were elected president and secretary, respectively. A new paper was arranged for, to be named the Voice of the Federation, with F. Stoddard as editor in chief.

Stoddard was soon succeeded by N. V. O. Larsen, the paper being printed by the Golden Gate Press at 122 Golden Gate Avenue, where many other radical papers were printed.

The next year William Fischer was elected president of the federation. Fischer had been a member of the Industrial Workers' of the World but was not a Communist. For this reason Henry Schrimpf was elected as a member of the board of trustees and on the editorial board with Barney Mayes. Mayes was then elected editor in chief.

Bridges did not like either Fischer or Mayes and, as these two men were quite independent, Bridges determined to get them both out.

Barney Mayes resigned under fire in December 1936 and made the following statement to the press: "The real explanation for this unusually vicious attack against me started in the efforts of the Communist Party to crucify me because I have resisted their attempts to dictate the policy of the Voice of the Federation. My fight was never based upon any personal consideration but upon the desire to prevent the same wrecking of unions which is inevitable when

the Communist Party becomes dominant in any situation. We are obliged to leave and let the new editor start from scratch."

At the 1938 convention of the federation, J. W. Engstrom was elected president. The joint executive and editorial committee is A. Virgin, Paul Benson, Harry Hook, John D. Schomaker, R. Merriweather, Carl Tillman, O. Rolstad, P. Kowalski, G. Sanfazan, and R. Fitzgerald.

The committee has now been placed in possession of the facts regarding the history of the organization of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific and also the general strikes of 1934.

We shall proceed now with the events which have taken place since the general strike of 1934.

We believe that the committee, after the examination of the evidence given in the basic brief, both documentary, and the testimony of witnesses who have heretofore appeared before it in relation to the maritime brief, will recognize that the events leading up to the general strike and the general strike itself may be considered as practices in class revolt. This is exactly what the Communist Party called it.

From the general strike the Communists claim to have learned the application of greater strategy for adaptation in the next general strike.

A full report of the general strike was taken to the Comintern and to the Seventh Congress of the Communist International at Moscow, by Sam Darcy, then leader of district 13 of the Communist Party of the United States of America.

From the report given, Communist International set out the principles for the future conduct of a general strike in the United States of America and these in turn were transmitted to the Communist Party of the United States.

The possibility of a break between John L. Lewis and the American Federation of Labor had already commenced to loom on the horizon. The events of 1935 and 1936 were to see this actual development.

Much of the literature of America, especially the magazines, took a definitely leftward trend. The Communist Party seized upon this and used it to great advantage, capturing the sympathies and support of many American writers.

Strike violence occurred throughout the United States and with it came an increasing tempo of action on the part of the Communist Party.

We are certain that the committee, prior to its coming to the Pacific coast, has already found that these strikes were more or less coordinated in character and showed all the earmarks of the development of class hostility. This was equally true on the Pacific coast.

In their official and affiliated organs, such as the Daily Worker, Western Worker, the Voice of Action, and the Voice of the Federation, the Communist Party has admitted its full responsibility for these strikes and has recognized them as practices in class revolt.

As we proceed to review the situation of the maritime industries, from the latter part of 1934 to the present date, we desire the committee to follow carefully and make notes of the many instances in which the International Longshoremen's Association of the Pacific coast and the maritime federation officiated or took part in strikes that did not have anything to do with the maritime industry, participating in many strikes that were purely political in character.

It is necessary for the committee to notice the reasons given by the Maritime Federation of the Pacific and the International Longshoremen's Association, as to why they took part in these strikes that were not of their own making.

A strong example of one of these strikes that was not connected with the maritime industry was one occurring among lumber workers in the vicinity of Eureka, Calif., in June 1935. Less than 5 percent of the timber workers went out on strike and when the president of the Pacific coast district of their union came to Eureka and examined the situation he declared that there was no strike.

Bridges, however, as one of the maritime group, sent in over 200 longshorement to assist the strikers.

It was this group of 200 that carried out the actual violence that was committed in Eureka.

This city of 24,000 inhabitants carries a police force normally of 8 police officers. During the rioting and violence the major proportion of the police force was incapacitated by rocks and clubs. The police as a last resort had to use firearms. When the struggle was over the police force had been rendered totally ineffective and Eureka was in the hands of the rioting longshoremen. This condition existed for a period of 24 hours, until the citizenry could

be mobilized. The Communist Party has claimed that the Eureka strike is the best illustration that they have had on the Pacific Coast of how a minor force can capture a whole city. We request the committee at this time to call the witnesses in the list appended to this report.

It is an interesting commentary that the newspapers of the Pacific coast wrote up the labor dispute in Eureka in detail but failed to point out the major thesis, namely, that a radical force had come in from outside of the county and captured a city of 24,000 people by terrorism and an attack upon its police force.

The same types of situations developed in Crockett, Calif., during the warehousemen's strike at the California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation plant in March 1935; the miners' strike in Jackson, Calif., in the same year; and the Salinas, Calif., lettuce strike, occurring in 1936.

These strikes are pointed out to the committee to show the use made by the International Longshoremen's Association and the Maritime Federation of the Pacific by the radical leader, Harry Bridges (now Pacific-coast director of the C. I. O.), as a disintegrating force in California's economic life.

At 8 a. m. on July 31, 1934, the longshoremen's strike was declared off and the men returned to work. On the 12th day of October 1934 the Hanna Arbitration Board announced its award. It is to be remembered by the committee that both the International Longshoremen's Association and the shipowners had agreed to abide by this award in full.

On November 16, 1934, a news bulletin given to all San Francisco newspapers announced: "The steamship *President Wilson* sailed Friday afternoon with a large shipment of coconuts still in her hold, due to the persistent refusal of the San Francisco longshoremen to handle it.

"This is but one of many similar instances which have occurred since the award was handed down on October 12. Eighteen separate strikes have occurred and two strikes are in progress at the present time. Each strike has been a definite violation of the award. In addition, a deliberate campaign of terrorism and intimidation has been instituted and numerous cowardly and brutal assaults have been committed. These assaults have been unlawful and reprehensible in every way, and they have been carried out to drive from the water front many longshoremen entitled to work under the award of the President's board."

At this time we desire to offer a press release dated December 16, 1934, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 21."

December 1934 and early 1935 were merely a repetition of the months of October and November 1934. Innumerable short strikes were the apparent order of the day.

The Equality Hall group, under Harry Bridges, was entrenching itself in San Francisco and along the whole Pacific coast. The United States Government seemed absolutely powerless to do anything.

Harry Bridges' own organ, the *Waterfront Worker*, and the official organ of the Communist Party, the *Western Worker*, carried out a deliberate coordinated attack upon the entire American Federation of Labor leadership and the International Seamen's Union, laying particular emphasis upon Harry Lundeberg, of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific.

It is noticed that just about 2 weeks before an action would be taken in the maritime federation or in the International Longshoremen's Local 38-79 an article would appear in one of these two papers clamoring for that action to be taken.

After this build-up, Harry Bridges and the others of the Equality Hall group, such as Henry Schrimpf, Henry Schmidt, John Schomaker, or John Shaw, would bring in the resolution and it would be passed.

Instead of giving this committee endless quotations from the *Waterfront Worker* or the *Western Worker*, we shall at this time list a number of quotations that may be read by the committee in the Files 1A and 1B, and 6A and 6B. In the *Western Worker*, we suggest that the following be read:

January 17, 1935, page 1, under the caption "Maritime Workers Industrial Union Offers to Merge With International Seamen's Union."

January 31, 1935, page 1: "Radio Operators Win Demands."

February 14, 1935, page 1: "Bridges Protests Greyhound Busses."

February 21, 1935, page 5: "Resolution of Central Committee Plenum."

March 7, 1935: "7,000 Maritime Workers Out on Anti-Nazi Strike."

April 4, 1935, page 3: "Bridges Makes Vicious Attack on Carl Scharrenburg."

April 8, 1935, page 1: "Firemen Move for Coastwise Strike."

April 15, 1935, page 1: "Call for Marine Workers to go Out on July 5th, for a 1-Day Strike Boycott."

April 15, 1935: "Marine Council Supports Antiwar Congress."

May 9, 1935, page 1: "I. L. A. District Meeting Opens in Portland."

May 13, 1935, page 1: "U. S. Navy Officers Aid Suppression of Philippine Uprising."

May 13, 1935, page 5: "What to Do When Arrested on Deportation Proceedings."

May 27, 1935, page 4: "What Would You Do in the Next General Strike?"

May 30, 1935, page 1: "Sailors Move to Kick Out Scharrenburg."

May 30, 1935, page 2: "Seaman Scab Is Dumped on Way Back to Vessel."

June 2, 1935, page 1: "Radio Operators Strike."

We now request the committee to read the following excerpts from the Waterfront Worker, Exhibits 1A and 1B, as follows:

Volume 3, No. 9: "Local 38-79 Votes to Down Tools for 30 Minutes in Protest Against 'Carlsruhe'."

Volume 3, No. 12: "The Tankers Strike."

Volume 3, No. 13: "The Tankers Strike."

Volume 3, No. 14: "The Tankers Strike."

Volume 3, No. 15: "Join With Teamsters in Oakland Strike."

Volume 3, No. 17: "Call for May Day Parade of 38-79."

Volume 3, No. 18, page 4: "Declare July 5th Holiday for Pacific Coast Maritime Federation."

Volume 3, No. 20, page 6: "Warehouse Strikes of 38-44."

These excerpts from the Waterfront Worker and the Western Worker will give the committee a clear picture of what transpired during the months involved. It can be clearly seen from them that these two organs constituted the actual press of the maritime federation at that time.

By June 1, 1935, the situation on the Pacific coast had become so bad that the president of the waterfront employers' union, Mr. T. G. Plant, was forced to write a letter to Mr. W. J. Lewis, district president of the International Longshoremen's Association. We request that this letter be introduced and marked as "Exhibit No. 22."

We quote from Mr. Plant's letter as follows:

"DEAR SIR: The agreement entered into August 7, 1934, between Pacific coast district 38 of the International Longshoremen's Association and the Waterfront Employers Union of San Francisco to submit all issues in dispute to arbitration by the National Longshoremen's Board, and to be bound by the provisions of the award, constituted a binding agreement between those two parties.

"That formal agreement was made pursuant to earlier commitments and pledges both parties had made to the National Longshoremen's Board, which commitments and pledges had resulted in the termination of the prolonged waterfront strike on July 31, 1934.

"The agreement was entered into by the employers in the sincere hope and belief that it would be observed scrupulously by both parties and that it would restore peace and orderly relationship on the water front.

"The agreement of August 7 and the subsequent award of October 12, 1934, both provided for the peaceable adjustment of disputes. Specifically the award required the establishment of a labor relations committee, to be composed of three representatives designated by the employers' association and three representatives designated by your association; that all disputes and grievances arising relating to working conditions would be investigated and adjudicated by that committee. There was a further provision for the appointment of an arbitrator in case the committee should deadlock. In short, the award provided the necessary machinery for the return and the maintenance of peaceable and orderly relationship.

"The agreement has not been kept by the officers and members of the San Francisco local of your association. In fact, it has been violated willfully, deliberately, and repeatedly.

"Strike after strike has occurred, causing severe financial losses to the employers, interruption of steamer schedules, and annoyance and loss to shippers and the traveling public.

"Some of the strikes have been caused to secure some new demand, others have been caused to secure a settlement of some alleged grievance, while still others have been in sympathy with other groups of employees. Many of the sympathetic strikes have been in support of demands of employees over whom the water front employers have had no jurisdiction whatsoever. The most recent and outstanding example of this last class of strikes has been the refusal by members of your association to handle cargo coming from the California

Packing Corporation, because of a dispute between that company and the warehousemen's union.

"From the date the award was handed down on October 12, 1934, over 150 separate strikes have occurred in San Francisco Bay district. Each strike has been a definite violation of the arbitration award.

"The employers have labored diligently and continuously to bring about a better understanding and to restore peace. Their efforts have proven fruitless.

"They are convinced that radical and destructive elements dominate the San Francisco local, and that no peace is possible while such an element is in control. The repeated admission by officers of the San Francisco local that the strikes have been in violation of the award, coupled with the defiant threat that the violations will continue, make no other conclusion possible.

"It must be apparent to you and to everyone that the employers cannot, with due regard for the public interest and the necessary regard for their own businesses, allow such an intolerable condition to continue any longer.

"No relationship can continue to exist unless agreements entered into are scrupulously observed, and unless there is mutual regard for the well-being of each other. To secure this, in a relationship such as we have attempted to set up, responsible leadership and responsible membership must exist in both groups. There is not such a responsible leadership in your San Francisco local, and our experience indicates a completely undisciplined membership.

"The employers have no thought in mind of attempting to upset the award, or of discontinuing their dealings with organized labor.

"They cannot, however, tolerate longer the conditions which have existed in this port for the past 8 months, and relationship with the San Francisco local of the International Longshoremen's Association cannot continue unless such changes are made as will make a continuance possible.

"They call upon you to bring about the necessary change in conditions.

"Yours very truly,

"T. G. PLANT, *President.*"

By means of threats, intimidations, and brutal assaults, all nonunion longshoremen were driven from the Pacific coast water fronts. Their places were taken by newly recruited members of the unions, many of whom had not heretofore been employed in this industry. This action was directly in violation of the award.

Any attempts to give men work who were not union men was immediately followed by a stoppage in work on the part of the International Longshoremen's Association. Efficiency dropped over 50 percent. Cost of handling cargo increased proportionately. Personal injury increased over 100 percent, and damage to cargo by longshoremen doubled also.

Strikers were still controlling the water front and cowardly assaults continued to occur.

Harry Bridges, probably best described the situation when he said: "To hell with the award. To hell with the Labor Relations Committee. We are running this show now, and we are going to tell you guys what to do and make you like it."

On June 22, 1935, occurred the tie-up of the steamship *Point Clear*, of the Swayne & Hoyt Lines.

On June 27, 1935, the following telegram was sent to Mr. W. J. Lewis, district president of the International Longshoremen's Association, by the Waterfront Employers' Association (we request that it be entered and marked as "Exhibit No. 23"):

"Since Saturday, June 22, the steamship *Point Clear*, operated by Swayne Hoyt, has been tied up at this port by refusal of longshoremen to pass through picket line established by maritime unions. There is no dispute between the operator of this vessel and any of seafaring employees working aboard her. There are no demands from any union having any dealings with the operator. There is nothing to discuss and apparently nothing to settle; all possible efforts to persuade the longshoremen to go to work has been made through the customary channels. This action of the San Francisco local of the I. L. A. constituting such a deliberate and outrageous violation of the agreement between that local and the San Francisco employers and culminating as it does a long series of deliberate and outrageous violations serves again to prove that the officials of the San Francisco local are proceeding on a willful policy of abrogation of the award and are doing everything in their power to provoke and prolong strife. Further dealings with the San Francisco local as it is now constituted are hopeless and useless. The employers again call upon you to

remove the radical leadership which is responsible for the situation. They furthermore must advise you that unless immediate steps are taken to return the longshoremen to work on the *Point Clear* the employers will find it necessary to terminate the agreement with the San Francisco local without further notice. The employers feel that their efforts over the last 9 months to make the agreement an effective means of returning peaceable and orderly relationship on the water front have been amply demonstrated and assure you now that the contemplated action will be taken for the sole purpose of securing a responsible body with which relationship can be resumed.

"WATERFRONT EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATION OF SAN FRANCISCO,
"T. G. PLANT, *President*."

Despite the protest of the Waterfront Employers' Association when it was notified that a strike would be held on July 5, the strike was held, and a "bloody Thursday" parade took place. The *Western Worker* for July 8, 1935, says as follows: "Hardly a winch or a wheel turned on the San Francisco water front today, and thousands upon thousands of marine workers threw their taunts in the face of the shipowners, their agents, the I. L. A. district officials, and the capitalist press. In spite of all the threats and obstructions thrown in the way of this day of commemoration, 25,000 maritime and other workers marched up Market Street from the Embarcadero—a 2-mile-long living memory to the martyrs of the 1934 maritime strike."

From our national point of view, this was a direct affront to the American people. First, because the longshoremen decided to work on July 4 in order to have the holiday on July 5; and, secondly, because the two men in whose honor the parade was held were killed while resisting police officers of the city of San Francisco who found it necessary in the discharge of their duties, in their own protection against an unruly horde of radical rioters, and to bring a semblance of peace out of a riotous chaos, to "shoot to kill." One of the rioters killed was a member of the Communist Party.

By the end of August the situation had reached such a point that it was necessary for the Waterfront Employers' Association to make an announcement to the public. We offer this announcement and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 24." We quote therefrom as follows:

"To the Public:

"The longshore and maritime strikes of last year, culminating in the general strike, were terminated by the submission of all controversies to arbitration under Government auspices.

"We realize that no arbitration award can entirely satisfy each party. But each party to an award must accept and scrupulously abide by it, or arbitration is futile.

"Therefore, Pacific shipowners and water-front employers have determined that—

"1. They will not terminate the maritime and longshore labor awards now in effect, although the awards impose heavy financial and operating burdens upon them—because these awards were arrived at only after months of painstaking investigation and deliberation by Government arbitration boards and were intended to be, and can be, a basis of permanent settlement, thus stabilizing the industry. The last award was handed down only 3 days ago.

"2. They will not agree to any demands by the men for changes in the awards—because any changes in the awards at this time would to all practical purposes abrogate them before the ink on them is scarcely dry. Abrogation is merely to renew last year's strike, and is an attack on the awards themselves. The awards themselves provide machinery for the arbitration of disputes arising under them.

"3. They will insist upon strict and honest observance of the awards by all contracting parties—because any strike or stoppage of work for any reason whatsoever is a violation of these awards. Sanctity of labor awards is essential to industrial peace.

"This statement is made that the public may know the position of the employers. They are determined that they will not be responsible for a renewal for last summer's strikes.

"PACIFIC SHIPOWNERS AND WATERFRONT EMPLOYERS.

"Dated, August 26, 1935."

At various times in 1935 the Secretary of Labor, Mrs. Perkins, had been appealed to, not only by the Waterfront Employers' Association, but also by many service bodies and individuals on the Pacific coast.

On November 29, 1935, Warren B. Francis, Times staff correspondent, at Washington, D. C., was granted an interview by Mrs. Perkins on the subject of the maritime industry on the Pacific coast.

The report of Mr. Francis' interview was published in the newspapers of the United States.

We quote therefrom:

"Refusal of maritime unions on the Pacific coast to observe arbitrator's rulings was tacitly approved today by Secretary of Labor Perkins as a new Federal mediation board prepared to step into the muddled Gulf of Mexico shipping situation.

"Announcing that both employers and unions have promised to cooperate in settling the Gulf controversy, Miss Perkins, in effect, washed her hands of the Pacific coast troubles and gave the Justice Department a free hand in initiating court action against the striking groups. Simultaneously, she conceded that the Federal Government is virtually powerless to enforce decisions of federally appointed arbitrators or compel unions to carry out terms of contracts negotiated under Federal auspices.

"The Secretary's views were disclosed in response to a series of questions about what steps Government authorities propose to take to effect the release of several vessels tied up at Pacific coast ports in connection with the Gulf controversy.

"The only action that can be taken to enforce the decision of an arbitrator should be taken by those responsible for the actions of their members,' Miss Perkins said, in replying to an inquiry as to whether the Government is contemplating any attempts to counteract the defiant attitude of maritime unions on the coast. Justifying the Government's failure to take a more aggressive stand, Miss Perkins termed the Pacific coast situation 'very peculiar,' 'it is very hard to hold anyone responsible.' She expressed a hope, however, that 'more rational heads will prevail.'

"Discussing the Pacific coast situation, Miss Perkins compared the refusal of the unions to carry out contract obligations with the refusal of members of a private club to agree with policies and decisions of the board of directors. She declared that the defiant groups as 'free American citizens' are entitled to dissent and commented 'that is the difference between a democratic country and an autocracy.'

"The new mediation board named Saturday to attempt a settlement of the Gulf shipping troubles will not take a direct hand in the Pacific coast controversies, Miss Perkins said, although it is expected that the situation at Los Angeles will be improved as a result of Federal intervention in the Gulf situation.

"Refusing to state whether she has received any definite assurance that strikers will return to work at Los Angeles Harbor, the Secretary based her optimism on the fact that 'If the Gulf situation is settled, the cargoes will no longer be hot,' and maritime unions will have no further reason to refuse to work ships coming from Gulf ports.

"The Labor Department has not attempted to prevent the Justice Department from initiating either civil or criminal action against union leaders charged with conspiracy to violate the antitrust laws, Miss Perkins said. The three commissioners of conciliation appointed to supervise negotiations between shipping companies and unions in the Gulf area expect to assemble for the first time Wednesday."

The year 1936 started out with sabotage. On the night of January 1st, the crew's dining room on the S. S. *Point Clear* had its tables and chairs chopped, dishes and coffee urns smashed with a fire ax.

The most significant action in January, however, was the desertion of the crew on the S. S. *Pennsylvania*, as it lay at its dock at pier 35 in San Francisco, on January 4. On the night of January 3 a crew delegation presented Mr. Hoskier with written demands signed by 33 members of the deck and engine-room crew for west coast articles and pay. The delegates explained that the crew had no quarrel with the Panama Pacific Lines, but were sore at east coast union officials for renewing agreements without getting the same wages and conditions as the west coast sailors enjoyed. The next morning 18 members of the engine crew packed their bags and rushed off the ship. They were later joined by members of the deck crew and stewards' departments.

In order to back up this desertion the International Longshoremen's Association, Local 38-79, passed the following resolution: "Refusing to work any ship from the east coast that is manned by men who have replaced the crews taking

action in efforts to gain the equivalent of the wages and conditions obtained on the Pacific coast; *And be it further resolved*, That we go on record as refusing to work any ship from the East if said ship is loaded by eastern longshoremen who have replaced longshore gangs which refused to work, in support of eastern men taking action in east coast ports."

It is to be noted by the committee that this resolution was introduced and read by Harry Bridges.

For 2 months the Communist Party, through its organs, the Western Worker and Waterfront Worker, had been advocating a mass-pressure strike to intimidate the courts in order to force the appellate court of California to liberate eight workers convicted of a dynamite plot at Modesto, Calif. Harry Bridges finally forced the longshoremen to pass the following resolution which, curiously enough, was passed on January 15, the day set for the return from the appellate court of its hearing in the case. We quote the resolution:

"Resolved, That all workers associated with the maritime industry on the Pacific coast go on record to stop work for 1 hour, the hour and date to be set by the Modesto Defense Committee, during the course of their appeal, as a mass protest against this vicious frame-up and all future frame-ups of all brothers and members of the working class; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution shall be introduced to all district councils of the Maritime Federation on the Pacific coast and to all central labor councils of all seaports on the Pacific coast, asking that such member organizations of these central labor councils who are directly connected with work on the water front, also observe the 1-hour stoppage of work."

This stoppage of work was general on the Pacific coast, in direct violation of the contractual obligations of the unions.

On January 23, 1936, the International Seamen's Union, at its national convention at Washington, D. C., passed a resolution which was to become the major bone of contention on the Pacific coast around which most of the trouble for this year revolved. The resolution was as follows:

"Resolved, That our Pacific unions be directed immediately to sever their connections with the Maritime Federation of the Pacific Coast until such time as the constitution of the Maritime Federation in the Pacific Coast shall conform to the constitution of the International Seamen's Union of America, and the constitution of the American Federation of Labor."

Upon the passage of this resolution the Western Worker, official Communist publication, immediately came out vigorously urging a revamping of the Maritime Federation constitution to meet this requirement of the International Seamen's Union. The Communists did not desire to be divorced from the American Federation of Labor. They had tried organizing their own unions, such as the T. U. U. L., but, failing, abandoned that plan and started their "boring from within" campaign.

At an emergency convention of the federation in San Francisco on November 22, 1935, a resolution had been introduced by Harry Bridges, redrafted by a special committee and unanimously adopted. This resolution had to do with job action, and as it has a direct bearing upon the action taken by the International Seamen's Union, we shall quote it in full:

"Whereas we believe and have demonstrated on numerous occasions that job action rightly used with proper control has been the means of gaining many concessions for the maritime workers on the Pacific coast, and

"Whereas job action is and should be action taken when any maritime group desires to gain a concession without openly resorting to a strike, and

"Whereas in order to eliminate confusion and to insure coordination in the best interests of all maritime groups concerned it is apparent that an organized procedure for job action must be laid down by this convention, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the term "job action" shall mean only action taken by any maritime group in attempting to gain from their employers some concessions not specifically provided for in their respective agreements or awards; and job action shall also mean action to enforce the award or agreement to the best interests of the maritime group concerned, or to prevent employers from violating agreements or awards, and be it further

"Resolved, That job action should be confined to a job such as a ship, dock, a shop, or a warehouse, unless otherwise agreed by all maritime groups affected; and any maritime group affected or liable to be affected should be notified and the issue in question placed before them, and be it further

"Resolved, That a committee of the maritime groups on the job shall be formed on the job to consolidate action and prevent misunderstandings, the

committee's authority not to exceed the constitution of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, and be it further

"Resolved, That when job action reaches the point in the opinion of the majority of the maritime groups affected by having their members pulled off the job, that to go further may jeopardize the Maritime Federation as a whole, the matter shall be referred when and where possible to the district council for further action or adjustment."

On Monday, January 27, 1936, the Western Worker published in large headlines, "Preparing to loose terror and violence, official statement issued by the Maritime Federation of the Pacific coast." Under this caption occurred the very famous statement that was later wired to President Roosevelt by Harry Bridges which was as follows:

"Unless the United States Government intervenes there will be launched on the Pacific coast within a month a struggle which will inevitably achieve the proportions of civil war."

We desire to point out to the committee at this time that there could have been no civil war unless Harry Bridges, and the Maritime Federation behind him, started it, and that, therefore, this telegram to the President was a direct threat on the part of the persons who sent it. There is no record to date of Mr. Roosevelt ever having rebuked the senders of this telegram.

Always ahead of Mr. Bridges, and preparing the way for the next thing that he intended to do in the Maritime Federation, the Western Worker on January 30, 1936, carried an editorial entitled "Maintain Unity of the Seamen." This editorial advocated that a fight be put up for the Pacific coast locals of the I. S. U. to remain in the parent organization. We quote in part:

"The sailors, the marine firemen, and the marine cooks and stewards must fight to remain a part of the I. S. U., and arouse such a storm of protest in every port and throughout the entire labor movement, that the Olanders and Scharrenbergs will not be able to carry through their splitting action."

Bridges seized upon the revocation of the sailors' charter by the I. S. U. to discredit the leader of the sailors, Harry Lundenberg. Anonymous bulletins and a whispering campaign appeared on the San Francisco water front advocating the recall of the newly elected secretary-treasurer of the S. U. P.

The month of February was marked by a strategic retreat on the part of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. It was struggling desperately over the situation existing between the Sailors' Union of the Pacific and the International Seamen's Union and was attempting to bring about unity in all the ports.

On March 2 the sailors on board the S. S. *California* announced a sit-down strike just a few minutes before sailing time; that is, they refused to work but remained aboard ship. The firemen elected to support the sailors. The cooks and stewards notified the captain that they would feed the passengers aboard while in port. They did not say whether they would work if the ship was taken to sea. At noon on March 4, the United States district attorney, Pierson M. Hall, announced that he was planning to issue a mutiny complaint against the strike leaders and possibly the entire crew of the S. S. *California*. As a result, the following day the crews sailed the ship.

Decisions in the Federal court have clearly established the fact that mutiny or conspiracy to mutiny can be committed in port, but it is interesting to note that Secretary Perkins exerted every effort to quash the mutiny charges against the striking members of the S. S. *California*, when Secretary of Commerce Roper urged the prosecution of the case. Secretary Perkins maintained that the men were merely on strike and should not be prosecuted on a criminal charge.

March saw little change in the maritime situation on the Pacific coast. The rapid-fire campaign of longshoremen to win coastwise standardized loads by the job-action route quickly slowed down with only small results.

The end of March 1936 marked the turning point in the history of the activities of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. It was the end of a year of job action and stoppage of work on any kind of suitable excuse.

In order that the committee may have the complete picture, we shall now give the list of all the ships on which job action or short strikes occurred, together with the reasons given by the strikers for their actions.

1. April 12: Steamship *Cuzco*; crew trouble at San Pedro account stewards.
2. May 8-10: Steamship *Golden Peak* at San Pedro; demanding discharge Filipinos; tied up 2 days.

3. May 15-18: Steamship *Willsolo*; crew struck on account of nonunion quartermaster; 3 days.
4. May 20: Steamship *Makua* at Hilo; crew refused connect oil hose. Unions cabled; released same day.
5. May 21-June 4: Steamship *Iowan* at Tacoma; Filipino deck crew; 14 days.
6. May 23: Steamship *Manukai*; Firemen's Union insisted loyal employee leave ship.
7. May 29: Steamship *Everett*, Powell River, British Columbia; firemen refused to furnish steam. Engineers furnished steam. Tied up a few hours.
8. June 3: Steamship *Manulai*; crew refused connect oil hose at Point Wells. Tied up a few hours.
9. June 11: Steamship *Maliko*; deck crew refused work on account overtime. Tied up few hours.
10. June 13: Steamship *Pt. Palmas*; dispute over overtime. Tied up few hours.
11. June 24: Steamship *Golden Star*; on account loyal employees at San Pedro; few hours.
12. June 29-October 3: Steamship *Pt. Clear*, San Francisco; struck ship account British Columbia cargo; 97 days.
13. July 3: Steamship *Dakotan*, San Francisco; crew demanded discharge two firemen; few hours.
14. July 10: Steamship *Pt. Sur*; crew struck; dissatisfied with quarters; few hours.
15. July 12: Steamship *Pt. Caleta*; crew refused to sign one-way articles; few hours.
16. July 16: Steamship *Timberrush*; crew on east articles; demanded west-coast agreement; few hours' delay.
17. July 16-July 17: Motorship *Willboto*, at San Pedro; crew struck; no agreement; 1 day.
18. July 19-September 30: Steamship *Shelton*, at Vancouver; crew deserted; 73 days.
19. July 19-September 30: Steamship *Golden State*, at Vancouver; crew deserted; 73 days.
20. July 19-September 30: Steamship *West Mahwah*, at Vancouver; crew deserted; 73 days.
21. July 19-September 30: Steamship *Point Ancha*, at Vancouver; crew deserted; 73 days.
22. July 29: Steamship *Kentuckian*; crew struck account demanded discharge of cook; released same day.
23. July 27-August 10: Steamship *Peter Kerr*, San Pedro; tied up account Chinese cooks in crew; 14 days.
24. August 1: Steamship *Pt. Reyes*; crew struck on account one-way articles; released same day.
25. August 2: Steamship *Pt. Arena*; crew refused to take ship to British Columbia; tied up few hours.
26. August 3-October 13: Steamship *Iowan*, San Francisco; Filipino deck crew; 41 days.
27. August 7-October 9: Steamship *Manukai*, Oakland; Filipino deck crew; 61 days.
28. August 9-August 11: Steamship *Culmar*; no engineers' agreement; released by engineers and again tied up by radio operators; 3 days.
29. August 9-August 11: Steamship *Losmar*; no engineers' agreement; released by engineers and again tied up by radio operators; 3 days.
30. August 9-August 11: Steamship *Vernar*; no engineers' agreement; released by engineers and again tied up by radio operators; 3 days.
31. August 14: Steamship *Everett*, at Vancouver; crew deserted; released after few hours.
32. August 15: Steamship *Illinois*, at Portland; firemen refused sign on as combination man; signed on pending decision of Labor Relations Board; few hours' delay.
33. August 15-September 5: Steamship *Tacoma*, at Oakland; Chinese stewards; 21 days.
34. August 19: Steamship *Golden Cloud*; deck crew, account hiring from dock; held few hours.
35. August 22: Steamship *President Jefferson*, Seattle; deck crew, account overtime; few hours.

36. August 27-29: Steamship *Golden Hind*; unlicensed crew struck account Filipino stewards; 2 days.
37. September 3-4: Steamship *Golden Hind*; deck crew refused paint over-side; 1 day.
38. September 4-6: Steamship *President Pierce*; unlicensed crew demanded discharge steward; 2 days.
39. September 5-6: Steamship *President Coolidge*; walked off in sympathy, firemen declaring poor ventilation in quarters; 1 day.
40. September 8: Steamship *Golden Bear*; crew refused sign articles to Seattle unless guaranteed passage back; few hours' delay.
41. September 9: Steamship *Willzipo*, Wilmington; Filipino deck crew; few hours.
42. September 12-13: Steamship *Texan*, San Francisco; crew's quarters unsatisfactory; 1 day.
43. September 16-17: Steamship *Pt. Lobos*; crew struck ship; crew quarters unsatisfactory; 1 day.
44. September 17-November 1: Steamship *Chiriqui*, at San Pedro; radio operators; company discontinued its Pacific-coast service, laying up the *Talmanca* also during this period; 45 days.
45. September 17: Steamship *Pt. Ancha*, Seattle; refused to sign on for British Columbia; few hours.
46. September 19: Steamship *New York*, Portland; Chinese stewards; few hours.
47. September 24: Steamship *Manulani*; crew struck in sympathy with long-shoremen; few hours.
48. October 4: Steamship *Lake Frances*; walked out on account *Fort Sutter* putting "hot" cargo on dock; few hours.
49. October 4: Steamship *Hamlin F. McCormick*; walked out account *Fort Sutter* putting "hot" cargo on dock; few hours.
50. October 4: Steamship *West Shipper*; walked out account *Fort Sutter* putting "hot" cargo on dock; few hours.
51. October 9-12: Steamship *Shetopa*, Portland; no radio 3 days.
52. October 9-12: Steamship *Pt. Caleta*, San Francisco; crew demanded rider in articles guaranteeing transportation back to San Francisco; signed articles with rider; 3 days.
53. October 10-11: Steamship *Defacto*, San Pedro; engineers' no agreement; 1 day.
54. October 16-19: Steamship *General M. H. Sherman*, San Pedro; alleged "hot" oil; 4 days.
55. October 16-19: Steamship *Pt. Ancha*; demanded rider in articles guaranteeing transportation back to San Francisco in case of strike in Gulf; 3 days.
56. October 18: Steamship *President Pierce*; demanded cash overtime; released same day.
57. October 18: Steamship *President Cleveland*; demanded cash overtime; released same day.
58. October 18-22: Steamship *Admiral Senn*, Oakland; demanded cash overtime; 4 days.
59. October 22-23: Steamship *Timberrush*, Portland; crew refused to sail with pilot; 1 day.
60. October 23: Steamship *Pt. Judith*; furnished crew with understanding will not go to British Columbia; released same day.
61. October 24-26: Steamship *Nevadan*; account revoking dock pass of patrolman; 2 days.
62. October 24-26: Steamship *Nebraskan*; account revoking dock pass of patrolman; 2 days.
63. October 24-26: Steamship *Golden Tide*; account revoking dock pass of patrolman; 2 days.
64. October 25-26: Motorship *Willmoto*; account revoking dock pass of patrolman; 1 day.
65. October 26-28: Steamship *Charles L. Wheeler*; tied up at San Pedro account crew demanding 6-hour day in port and \$1 overtime; 2 days.
66. October 26-28: Steamship *H. F. McCormick*; tied up at San Pedro account crew demanding 6-hour day in port and \$1 overtime; 2 days.
67. October 28: Steamship *Golden Harvest*; crew refused to sign articles; released same day.
68. October 28-30: Steamship *Golden Harvest*; demanded optional overtime be paid in cash; 2 days.

69. October 28–November 2: Steamship *Jefferson Myers*; crew refused to sign articles unless rider be put on guaranteeing transportation, wages and subsistence back to Portland in case of strike on east coast; 5 days.
70. November 2–29: Steamship *Katrina Luckenbach*, at San Pedro; longshoremen refused to work Gulf cargo; 27 days.
71. November 4–8: Steamship *President Harrison*, tied up at San Pedro; unlicensed crew demand discharge of chief steward; 4 days.
72. November 7–9: Steamship *Montara*, at San Pedro; longshoremen; Gulf cargo; 32 days.
73. November 7–12: Steamship *Pt. Lobos*, at New Orleans; unable to get crew from unions; Gulf cargo; 5 days.
74. November 8–December 22: Steamship *Chetopa*, tied up at Galveston, Tex.; crew refused to move ship; Gulf cargo; moved to Houston by pilot and officers, and again tied up; unable to get crew from unions; 44 days.
75. November 11–29: Steamship *Matthew Luckenbach*, at San Pedro; Gulf cargo; 18 days.
76. November 12–13: Motorship *Missourian*, San Francisco; unlicensed engine-room crew demand discharge of two electricians; released 9:15 a. m., November 13; 1 day.
77. November 12–21: Steamship *Plow City*, San Francisco; unlicensed deck crew demand rider in articles, guaranteeing subsistence and return transportation in case of strike on east coast; 9 days.
78. November 13–21: Steamship *Sage Brush*, San Francisco, east-coast ship, Shepard Line; certain new crew members demand return transportation in case of strike; 8 days.
79. November 15–21: Steamship *President Taft*, at San Francisco; crew demand rider in articles; 6 days.
80. November 19–24: Steamship *Pomona*, at Longview, Wash.; crew demand rider in articles; 5 days.
81. November 19–December 9: Steamship *Pt. Palmas*, at San Pedro; Gulf cargo; 18 days.
82. November 20–29: Steamship *Pacific*, at Alameda; no agreement with M. M. & P., M. E. B. A., and A. R. T. A.; 9 days.
83. November 21–December 24: Steamship *Diamond Head*, at Oakland; unlicensed deck crew refused to clean tanks; 33 days.
84. November 26–29: Steamship *Sutherland*, at San Francisco; crew demand discharge of second officer; 3 days.
85. November 30: Steamship *Tesau*, at San Francisco; 9:30 a. m. unlicensed engine-room crew struck, objected to change in rating of watertenders; ship picketed; longshoremen walked off for short time; released at noon same day.
86. November 30–December 21: Steamship *Buffalo Bridge*, at Houston, Tex.; crew refused to move ship, alleged "hot" cargo; no longshoremen involved in loading; 21 days.
87. November 30–December 9: Steamship *Pt. Lobos*, at San Pedro; alleged hot cargo; 9 days.
88. November 30–December 3: Steamship *Pt. Reyes*, at Alameda; crew demand cash payment for transportation; 3 days.
89. November 30–December 9: Steamship *Pt. Gorda*, at San Pedro; Gulf cargo; sailed for San Francisco December 8; arrived San Francisco December 9; released; 9 days.
90. November 30–December 9: Steamship *Pt. Arena*, at San Pedro; Gulf cargo; 9 days.
91. December 3–9: Steamship *Katrina Luckenbach*, San Francisco; again tied up; Gulf cargo; 6 days.
92. December 3–9: Steamship *Mathew Luckenbach*, at San Pedro; again tied up; Gulf cargo; 6 days.
93. December 3–9: Steamship *Jacob Luckenbach*, at San Pedro; again tied up; Gulf cargo; 6 days.
94. December 5–6: Steamship *Columbian*, at Portland; longshoremen demand cut-down loads; 1 day.
95. December 5–6: Steamship *American*, at Portland; longshoremen demand cut down loads; 1 day.
96. December 6–7: Steamship *Maliko*, at Seattle; crew refused to clean tanks; 1 day.
97. December 7: Steamship *Forbes Hauptman*, at San Francisco; unlicensed engine-room crew struck on account of loading Standard Oil products; released in about 2 hours.

98. December 8-9: Steamship *Florence Luckenbach*, at San Pedro; Gulf cargo; 1 day.
99. December 9-10: Steamship *Pt. Gorda*, at San Francisco; Gulf cargo; 1 day.
100. December 9-11: Steamship *Wildwood*, at San Pedro, Shepard Line; steward discharged (seamen demanded); 2 days.
101. December 10: Steamship *Birmingham City*, at San Francisco; account M. E. B. A. no agreement; few hours.
102. December 10: Steamship *Mauli*, at San Francisco; crew refused to clean tanks; ship still tied up after 17 days.
103. December 10-11: Steamship *Hegira*, at San Francisco; crew trouble; east-coast agreement; demand west coast; 1 day.
104. December 10-11: Steamship *Ioucan*, at San Pedro; Filipino crew, stevedores walked off; 1 day.
105. December 13: Steamship *Golden Hind*, at San Francisco; unlicensed crew walked off, picketed ship; longshoremen quit; oilers refused to oil winches; misunderstanding; released same day.
106. December 14: Steamship *Wilthilo*, at San Francisco; crew demand discharge of chief steward; few hours.
107. December 14-18: Steamship *Wilthilo*, at San Francisco; again tied up; deck crew refuse to sign articles unless rider taken off the articles requiring crew to work cargo; 4 days.
108. December 16: Steamship *Manukai*, at San Francisco; crew trouble; released same day.
109. December 16: Steamship *Wildwood*, at San Francisco; crew replacements demand west-coast articles; still tied up after 11 days.
110. December 23-24: Steamship *Ohioan*, at San Pedro; unlicensed crew refused to sail with Filipinos; 1 day.
111. December 24: Steamship *Munoa*; crew refuse to connect oil hose, Standard Oil Barge; released same day.
112. December 27-January 5: Steamship *Pt. Reyes*, at New Orleans; crew demand cash bonus provided in strike rider; no strike existing; union furnished new crew; no concessions made; 9 days.
113. December 27-January 2: Steamship *Diamond Head*, at Oakland; again tied up; crew refuse to clean tanks; Labor Relations Board granted extra wage for work; 6 days.
114. December 30-January 3: Steamship *Helen Whittier*, at Hilo; unlicensed crew struck in sympathy with scalers; stevedores quit; 5 days.
115. December 30-January 2: Steamship *Mana*, at Honuapo; crew struck in sympathy with scalers; 4 days.
116. January 1-2: Steamship *Pt. Sur*, at Alameda; crew wrecked messroom; difficulty getting replacements; no specific complaint; 2 days.
117. January 2: Steamship *Malolo*, at Honolulu; sympathy strike; short time.
118. January 4-9: Steamship *Pennsylvania*, at San Francisco; unlicensed crew demand west-coast articles; no concession made; independent crew recruited; 5 days.
119. January 5-10: Steamship *Robert Luckenbach*, at San Francisco; crew demand west-coast articles; compromise made; 5 days.
120. January 6-10: Steamship *William Luckenbach*, at San Francisco; crew demand west-coast articles; compromise made; 4 days.
121. January 7-8: Steamship *Golden Harvest*, at San Francisco; crew replacements demand \$5 per day; no concession made; 1 day.
122. January 8-10: Steamship *Edgar Luckenbach*, at San Francisco; crew demand west-coast articles; compromise; 2 days.
123. January 8-9: Steamship *Helen Whittier*, at Honolulu; again tied up; crew demand return rider; no concession made; 1 day.
124. January 8-15: Steamship *Calmar*, at San Francisco; crew demand west-coast articles; no concession made; 7 days.
125. January 18-22: Steamship *Malu*, at Honuapo; unlicensed crew struck on account of alleged blacklisted longshoremen; no concession made; 4 days.
126. January 19-22: Steamship *Golden Coast*, at Honolulu; account alleged blacklisted longshoremen; no concession; 3 days.
127. January 19-22: Steamship *Mauli*, at Honolulu; account alleged blacklisted longshoremen; no concession; 3 days.
128. January 20-22: Steamship *Makiki*, at Honolulu; account alleged blacklisted longshoremen; no concession; 2 days.

129. January 20-21: Steamship *Pt. Clear*, at San Francisco; crew demand overtime for cleaning cargo holds (sulphur cargo); Labor Relations Board granted extra pay; 1 day.
130. January 21-23: Steamship *F. J. Luckenbach*, at San Francisco; sympathy with ship's clerks; company met clerks' demands; 2 days.
131. January 21-23: Steamship *Dorothy Luckenbach*, at San Francisco; sympathy with ship's clerks; met demands; 2 days.
132. January 21-23: Steamship *K. I. Luckenbach*, at San Francisco; sympathy with ship's clerks; met demands; 2 days.
133. January 21-22: Steamship *California*, at San Francisco; crew demand discharge of east coast men; no concession; 1 day.
134. January 27-28: Steamship *Heffron*, at Portland; steward's crew demand extra messman; no concession; 1 day.
135. January 28-30: Steamship *Jane Christenson*, at Longview; crew demand strike rider; no concession; 2 days.
136. February 11: Steamship *Manukai*, San Francisco; crew refused to connect oil hose; crew finally yielded; short time.
137. February 14: Steamship *Heffron*, San Pedro; crew refused to take lines of Standard Oil barge; unions ordered men to work; 5 hours' delay.
138. February 14: Steamship *California*, at sea; smooth, calm weather; seamen refused to man lifeboats during life-saving drill; "incident" entered in log; no further action to date.
139. February 15-18: Steamship *Columbian*, at San Francisco; account controversy over number of trailers to be hauled by jitney; I. L. A. yielded; 2 days.
140. February 23: Steamship *Condor*, at San Pedro; crew refused to handle Standard Oil products; crew yielded; several hours' delay.
141. February 26: Steamship *Pacific Ranger*, Portland; controversy over size of sling loads; union yielded; short time.
142. February 27-28: Steamship *Pt. Chico*, San Francisco; firemen's union refused replacements for five men discharged for insubordination; union yielded after Labor Relations Board hearing; 1 day.
143. March 2-5: Steamship *California*, San Pedro; crew refused take ship to sea; demanding west-coast wages and agreements; crew yielded when United States attorney threatened to prosecute them on mutiny charges.
144. March 6-9: Steamship *President Taft*, San Francisco; longshoremen sling-load controversy; Labor Relations Committee ruled favor of employers; 3 days.
145. March 7: Steamship *Democracy*, San Francisco; union demanded company ship new chief steward; demand withdrawn; old steward shipped; several hours.
146. March 10: Steamship *Democracy*, San Pedro; deck and engine crew demand quarters be remodeled immediately; compromise work to be done at sea; several hours.
147. March 10-12: Steamship *Everett*, Seattle; longshore sling-load controversy; Labor Relations Committee ruled favor of I. L. A.; 3 days' delay.
148. March 14-19: Steamship *Manini*, San Francisco; sailors' union demanded deck boys be hired from Union Hall; matter referred to Bureau of Navigation; boys remained on board; 5 days.
149. March 17-18: Steamship *Maui*, San Francisco; sailors' union demanded deck boys be hired from Union Hall; matter referred to Bureau of Navigation; boys remained on board; 2 days.
150. March 20-22: Steamship *Antigua*, San Francisco; firemen refused to pass one-man picket line set up by discharged junior engineer; Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association upheld discharge for cause; company agreed give discharged man another chance on another ship; 2 days.
151. March 25-26: Steamship *Manini*, St. Helena, Columbia River; crew demanded discharge of deck boys; boys intimidated into deserting; 1 day.
152. March 25-26: Steamship *Daisy Green*, San Francisco; A. R. T. A. demand radioman be carried; demand temporarily withdrawn; 1 day.
153. March 25-26: Steamship *Golden Bear*, San Francisco; crew refused to work after 5 p. m. unless paid cash overtime; longshoremen refused to work unless paid stand-by time; union furnished new gangs; 18 hours.
154. March 25-26: Steamship *Manukai*, Honolulu; crew drunk, demanded discharge of carpenter because "nonunion"; next morning, sober, discovered carpenter good union man; demand withdrawn; 12 hours.

155. March 26: Steamship *Manulani*, San Pedro: longshoremen sling-load controversy; compromise load pending arbitration; half day.

156. March 27-30: Steamship *Selandia*, Willapa Harbor, Wash.; longshoremen refused to go through lumber-mill workers' picket line; picket line withdrawn; 4 days.

On April 2, 1936, Harry Bridges issued orders to the longshoremen that they should refuse to handle 15 tons of scrap iron consigned to the motorship *Fella* of the Libera Lines. Despite the fact that the cargo in question was properly cleared by the United States Customs Office, Bridges declared that it was "war contraband." Bridges issued the following statement:

"We will handle this scrap iron only when, and if, Secretary of State Hull advises us that it is not contraband.

The motorship *Fella* had to sail that night without the scrap iron.

On the same date, April 2, 1936, the Pacific Coast Longshoremen carried the following article: "Mr. Thompson, representing the American Friends of the Soviet, addressed the membership. He had been invited by the board of trustees to outline and explain a proposition to send a delegate to the Soviet Union. He explained that such a delegate would travel with a large delegation of union representatives from all parts of the United States."

The Waterfront Worker of April 6, 1936 (see exhibit 1B), stated as follows: "Prepare for action. The seamen on the east coast are on strike, striking against the corrupt I. S. U. leadership, against the ridiculous charges of mutiny of the *California* crew and for west coast wages and conditions. The *Santa Rosa* and the *Sage Brush* are headed for the west coast with a full crew of scabs. The Grace Co. has deliberately manned their ships with scabs. It is a clear-cut issue. Do we work with scabs? We must refuse to touch any part of the rat ship. One of the reasons we had to do considerable maneuvering in the past to avoid strike actions was the issues were not clear and they were not strong enough.

"Now, we have an open challenge by the shipowners on a national basis which we cannot ignore. We have demonstrated to the public and to organized labor that we are not looking for trouble, but the present issue at stake is unionism. We cannot avoid it. We must fight."

The seamen's strike of the east coast referred to in the above article was not a strike, but an attempt to create trouble on the New York water front by one Joseph Curran, a ringleader of the mutiny on the steamship *California*, mentioned heretofore in this brief.

The steamship *Santa Rosa* had a full union crew aboard it, but because the International Seamen's Union men had the courage to defy Joseph Curran's "provisional strike committee," they were branded as scabs and the Communist Party immediately took up Curran's battle in the San Francisco Longshoremen's Union.

On April 3, 1936, Harry Bridges, speaking before the San Francisco Central Labor Council, stated as follows regarding the steamship *Santa Rosa*:

"On the way from New York there are ships manned entirely by scabs. There is the *Santa Rosa* with a crew of 350. We don't believe it's coming here just for the trip. It is going to load passengers and freight. We can stand by idly, where we can see that it is not done except by union men. The maritime unions can't stand idly by and see the things they fought so hard for taken away from them.

"We have done all we can to avoid these things. Now we believe the organized forces against us are ready. We have no alternative. The east- and west-coast shipowners are acting together."

The *Santa Rosa* docked on April 14 at San Francisco and immediately maritime federation pickets were put out to prevent longshoremen from going on the dock to work the cargo. The Waterfront Employers' Association immediately suspended all relations with local 38-79.

For the benefit of the committee, we will point out discussions leading up to this particular situation.

On February 3, 1936, local 38-79 voted to boycott east-coast ships coming to the Pacific coast with crews that replaced striking seamen. On April 6, Bridges advised the Grace Co. that the liner *Santa Rosa* would not be worked unless the International Seamen's Union crew was discharged and replaced with seamen meeting his approval under full west-coast agreement. On April 8, San Francisco Council, No. 2, Maritime Federation of the Pacific, adopted a resolution to boycott ships such as the *Santa Rosa*. On April 10 the San Pedro District

Council, No. 4, Maritime Federation of the Pacific, at the request of Harry Bridges, adopted a similar resolution. On April 13 the *Santa Rosa* docked at San Pedro, Calif., to discharge passengers and mail, but no attempt was made to work cargo there. The *Santa Rosa* then sailed for San Francisco.

On April 16, local 38-79 held a mass meeting, and Bridges and other Communists introduced a strike resolution.

The morning of April 17 saw squad cars from local 38-79 patrolling the water front in order to prevent longshoremen from applying for work at the dock. The Maritime Federation of the Pacific rescinded its resolution declaring all east-coast ships "hot" and the San Francisco Central Labor Council appointed a committee of seven to assist in peace negotiations.

It is significant to note that at this time the San Francisco Central Labor Council refused a vote of confidence to Harry Bridges and his leadership.

The committee's attention is again invited to the mass meeting held at the Dreamland Auditorium on April 16, 1936, where the International Longshoremen's Association voted complete confidence in Harry Bridges. At this meeting a vote was passed to send Bridges and Ralph Mallen by airplane to address a mass meeting at Portland, Oreg., on the following Sunday, and Otto Kleiman was dispatched to San Pedro to address a mass meeting of the I. L. A. local there. Please note that all of the ambassadors were members of the original Equality Hall group and members of the Communist Party.

We have dealt with the subject of the steamship *Santa Rosa* quite at length because it plays an important part in the relations between the Waterfront Employers Association and the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. The suspension of relations with local 38-79 was not directed at the local, but purely at the radical and Communist leaders of that union.

Over a period of 18 months since the Hanna award was granted, there were more than 400 flagrant violations by this union of their agreement, and their refusal to work cargo on the steamship *Santa Rosa* was the culmination of an interminable series of strikes.

The negotiation committee which was appointed by local 38-79 to meet with the employers included John Marlowe. He was presumed to be next in line for president of local 38-79 and the Communist Party felt that he would go along with Bridges in the negotiations. To the surprise of everyone Marlowe went with the conservative side and a tentative agreement with the employers was signed on Saturday night, the 18th.

The party immediately had to change its tactics, and a wire was sent to Harry Bridges in Portland ordering him to return immediately. The best was made of a bad situation and another mass meeting was called at which time Bridges declared that a victory had been gained for their local 38-79. Bridges did, however, force the negotiating committee to issue the following statement:

"We, the committee, are taking this position now, realizing we have mistakenly and inadvertently disobeyed the instructions of our membership at their last meeting, and to convince the membership that our mistake was honest and unintentional, we wish now to publicly announce our mistake, and declare the tentative memorandum that we signed absolutely without authority, is null and void."

Despite this repudiation, however, the agreement was signed on April 21 and the longshoremen went back to work.

The ink was scarcely dry on the agreement concerning the *Santa Rosa* and future respect of contracts, when another "job action" was called. This was purely political in character and similar to the incident of the motorship *Fella* which we have heretofore reported. The motorship *Feltre* of the Liberia line was refused handling by the longshoremen on the grounds it was loading scrap metal for Italy. In reality this scrap metal was being consigned by the Italian San Francisco colony to the Italian Red Cross and did not come under the classification of contraband.

There was no cessation in "hot cargo" disputes or "job action." It became increasingly apparent that the water front employers were going to have to make amendments in their contract when the present award expired.

On May 5, the International Longshoremen's Association convened at San Pedro, Calif. It resulted in a sweeping victory for the Equality Hall group. Among the resolutions introduced by this group were:

1. Endorsing the principle of the industrial unions as advocated by John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers.
2. To organize flour mill and cereal industry workers as I. L. A. affiliates.
3. Declaring embargo on munitions of war, including scrap iron.

4. Requiring that not less than 5 percent of new men registered be Negroes.
5. Authorizing representatives to the national Negro congress.
6. Giving active support to the Modesto defense fund and Tom Mooney.
7. Stop work in each port 1 hour during the Modesto appeal.
8. Repeal of the California Criminal Syndicalism Act.
9. Assessing all longshoremen \$1 for contribution to the Democratic campaign fund. Money to be sent to James Farley, 30 percent to be used in Pacific Coast States.

A resolution endorsing a farmer-labor party, introduced by the Equality Hall group, failed to pass.

Bridges won the nomination for district president and was later elected.

Shortly after the International Longshoremen convention at San Pedro the official publication of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, the Voice of the Federation, published an article advocating a transportation federation of America under the caption "Organize, or Else." We give it here verbatim:

"One of the most important issues that is facing the workers in the marine transportation industry today is the question of industrial unionism.

"In order to protect ourselves, our membership should include all forms of transportation, passenger as well as freight, both on land and sea and even in the air. This form of organization will have to be started now, lest the structure on which we are now standing, crumble under our feet.

"It is becoming apparent that the destruction of our present set-up already exists within our form of organization. The closely interlocking functions of the various branches of the transportation industry makes it absolutely necessary for the workers in the various branches to act as one group.

"If they fail to do so, they will find that when the freight tariff in the marine transportation becomes higher than the rate charged by rail, bus, or air, due to the fact that the workers in that branch are being better paid, or work under better conditions, then the freight and passenger revenue will automatically be transferred into the branch where the workers are working under a lower standard of living.

"In other words, when the irregularity of service or the higher rates on ships annoys the public, then they will send the freight and travel by rail, and when that happens, the ships will be laid up. Since our members are skilled in the sailing of ships, their value will be depreciated even should they eventually be absorbed in the branch of the industry in which the increase in traffic has occurred.

"Therefore, in order to keep the employment and earning power stable, we must affiliate ourselves with the other branches until the workers in the transportation industry control every unit of transportation whether it flies, floats, or runs on wheels, and when that organization has been perfected, we will have in our hands the key that will open the door to a more abundant life not only for the workers in our industry but for all workers."

The ambition of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific was to extend its influence. Therefore, organizations were set up on the Gulf and the Atlantic coast, with the intention of forming a National Maritime Federation, but their ambitions did not end there. It was their hope, when the National Maritime Federation was formed, to extend its influence internationally. This ambition was the fundamental of the Comintern in its international effort to control the transportation facilities of the entire world.

We have already called the attention of the committee to the cooperation of Harry Bridges on the west coast with Joe Curran on the east coast which resulted in the *Santa Rosa* incident.

By June 1, 1936, the situation in the American Federation of Labor regarding the fight with Mr. John L. Lewis was becoming serious. Already the hand of the Communist Party was in the Committee for Industrial Organization. There was no doubt that the Communist Party would take advantage of this situation and bore into the maritime federation, which it proceeded to do.

On the first Saturday and Sunday in June 1936, Communist district No. 13, held its convention at Willapi Hall on Saturday and the New Bayshore Hall on Sunday, in San Francisco. At this convention, a representative of the Comintern, gave instructions to district No. 13. The Sunday meeting was interrupted about 5:10 p. m. by police, who had been informed that a fight was in progress, but after the police left an election was held.

At this election, Mr. Harry Bridges, president of the district I. L. A., was elected as a district committee member of district No. 13 of the Communist Party and was also constituted a bureau member of district 13.

We request the committee at this time to call the witnesses indicated in the list of witnesses attached to this report to substantiate the above.

The district bureau formulated the following policy to be submitted to all concerned:

First, that it was the intention of the party to keep peace in the United States and on the Pacific coast in particular until after the general election.

Second, that the Communist Party was going to use every effort to bring the Sailors' Union of the Pacific back into the International Seamen's Union, in order that they could control the whole maritime situation on the Pacific coast.

Third, that they were going to use the Seamen's Union as a bone of contention if the shipowners opened the award, rather than the International Longshoremen's Association.

Fourth, that in any event, if and when awards were opened either by the shipowners or the Longshoremen's Association, they would agree to an extension of the agreement for a period of 1 year regardless of the terms therein, but with no intention of keeping the agreement after April 30, 1937.

Fifth, that they would assist in every way the organization of the industrial unions.

Sixth, that when Mr. John L. Lewis had accomplished the organization of the steel, rubber, automotive industries, they would then break the awards on the Pacific coast, Gulf, and Atlantic coast, and cause a Nation-wide general strike.

Seventh, that they would increase the membership of the Newspaper Guild and establish nuclei in the various newspapers so that they could control the presentation of news by the papers at the time of the calling of the general strike.

The witnesses referred to can be used to substantiate this policy, also.

With the assistance of the Communist Party Bridges proceeded to gain absolute control of the I. L. A. and the maritime federation. Emissaries were sent to the Gulf to organize the Gulf. One, J. W. Allen, alias Von Ermen, was the party functionary used in the Gulf. He was a former relief officer for the Matson Line.

Roy Pyle, of the American Radio Telegraph Association, proceeded to New York and consulted with Roy Hudson, president of the Marine Workers' Industrial Union, and a member of the central committee of the Communist Party of the United States. There they formulated a policy for coordination of activities on the Atlantic coast that would follow the leadership of Harry Bridges on the Pacific coast.

After Earl Browder had accepted his nomination for the Presidency on the Communist Party ticket, he proceeded to the Pacific coast and visited with the bureaus of district 12 and 13.

At the time of Browder's visit it was still considered necessary to maintain peace, but at this time the shipowners decided to open the award. After the first few meetings between maritime representatives and the shipowners, it became apparent to the Communist groups what tactics the shipowners had decided to follow. This necessitated a change in plans on the part of the Communist Party and the Equality Hall group on the Pacific coast.

Roy Hudson was sent to the Pacific coast and remained in San Francisco directing all negotiations of the party in the maritime federation and newspaper organizations for the whole Pacific coast. The first result was an order on the part of the party to stiffen the attitude of the unions, and finally the following statement was issued to the party by the bureau during the last week in August 1936:

"1. We must exploit the situation with all its implications to the end that—

"(a) A general improvement all around of conditions of labor, hours, wages, etc., for longshoremen.

"(b) Decided improvement of labor, hours, wages, etc., for seamen.

"(c) General improvement for all other crafts in the shipping and maritime industry.

"(d) The setting up of a more inclusive provisional apparatus with a view of taking the Maritime Federation of the Pacific a step higher in the direction of industrial unionism.

"(e) Unofficial representation on the C. I. O. (John Lewis's new 'Committee for Industrial Organization').

"2. Finally, under no circumstances to fail to take advantage of the general favorable situation to the end that—

"(a) The Communist Party shall increase in influence and membership;

"(b) The people's front shall advance immeasurably; and

"(c) Moral and financial aid shall be given to the C. I. O. in the fight against the reactionary A. F. of L. leadership.

"MARITIME STRIKE POLITICAL NECESSITY

"3. Further, in the matter of the Pacific coast maritime situation, it is decided—

"(a) A general maritime strike is not only possible but a practical political necessity.

"(b) Every effort should be made to conduct 'negotiations' in such a way as to gain the 'moral' prerequisite for a strike—should serious gains otherwise be impossible.

"(c) Loose connections with the Northwest must be strengthened by means of unlimited support to the P. I. Guild newspaper strike and to the aspirations of certain 'leaders.'

"(d) At the same time a definite understanding must be worked out between the Buros, Harry Bridges, California, Morris Rapport, Washington, and the leadership of the Washington Commonwealth Federation with a view to complementing the general situation—guild strike, marine strike—in such a way that one may lead to the other.

"4. It must be understood that we must conduct ourselves in such a way as to advance—

"(a) The perspectives of a new manifold upsurge of class struggle;

"(b) The definite realization of a Farmer-Labor Party alinement of the west coast; and

"(c) The bringing about on the west coast an internal alinement similar to the C. I. O."

We desire at this time to introduce a confidential memorandum covering the above, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 25."

We shall now return to the maritime federation convention which ended in San Pedro on June 10, 1936. The maritime federation adopts the following resolutions:

"1. Endorse campaign for repeal of criminal syndicalism law and release all persons in jail for same.

"2. To designate July 5, 'Bloody Thursday' Maritime Memorial Day, calling upon all affiliated unions to observe this by work stoppage. (This was referred to a referendum.)

"3. Protest aggressive war and facism.

"4. Embargo on war materials.

"5. Authorize maritime federation district mass meetings for all member unions at least once a month.

"6. Organize maritime federation in the District of British Columbia.

"7. Organize national maritime federation, embracing all phases of marine-transportation industries.

"8. Recommend that radio telegraphers make September demand that they be not required to do clerical or purser work.

"9. Set definite rules for sailors and longshore work on steam schooners.

"10. Establish a Mooney-defense committee in each federation district. Sell 40,000 '45-cent free Mooney and Billings' stamps."

The perusal of those resolutions is enough to point out to the committee the control of the Equality Hall group and the Communist Party.

On July 5, 1936, the maritime federation staged its "Bloody Thursday" parade. They claimed that 10,000 men marched in the parade.

On July 9 it was announced that Harry Bridges had been elected president of the district I. L. A. for 1936-37.

On July 22 the Maritime Federation of the Pacific announced that all propositions on referendum ballot had carried and then called for a coast-wide meeting on the proposed September demands to be held on August 4 and 5, in San Francisco.

These resolutions that were passed by the referendum set up the federation not as a negotiating agency but merely a coordinating agency with power to

block negotiations that any occasion might demand. Their plan, briefly, was to authorize the federation as a coordinating agency which would approve demands and force employers to sign with all unions simultaneously; to split employer organizations by dealing with individual employers and individual groups of employers, one at a time. All agreements were to include (a) right of union men to refuse to pass picket lines; (b) a guaranty that there would be no discrimination against any man because of union activities; (c) a preferential agreement clause; and (d) recognize the right of unions to take joint action to enforce agreements.

On July 31, 1936, the water-front employers served formal notice on I. L. A. district officials and four major locals that they intended to "open the award" and suggested that negotiations be started at the earliest possible date and made the proposal that all issues not settled by September 1 be submitted to arbitration on that date or immediately thereafter, in order to eliminate any possibility of a nonagreement interim after September 30.

We point out to the committee at this time that it was not the intention of the Equality Hall group to want any strikes in 1936 and that the seamen were being used as the "cat's paw" to effect trading with the water-front employers.

The August 17, 1936, Western Worker published the following editorial:

"Obviously, the water-front unions cannot at this time state that they are prepared to submit all disputed points to arbitration. The union men are determined to win certain burning minimum demands which will make life on board the ships less of a hell of exploitation. To agree at this time to submit these essential demands to arbitration would be in effect a surrender of these demands to the shipowners."

The significance of this quotation is the fact that it does not refer to the longshoremen but to the seamen and was the first step of the Communist Party to further its program of having the seamen carry the battle.

On August 19, 1936, the Sailors' Union of the Pacific notified the employers that all agreements and awards would terminate September 30. The Sailors' Union of the Pacific offered to negotiate their agreements but insisted that these agreements must be with the Sailors' Union of the Pacific alone. Both the Sailors' Union of the Pacific and the Firemen's Union rejected the employers' offer to an immediate agreement to arbitrate all unsettled issues as of September 1.

Negotiations with the International Longshoremen's Association began on August 24, but after a full week of meetings they were still deadlocked on the question of submitting all disputed issues to arbitration. This was merely stalling on the part of Harry Bridges and his group in order that the seamen's union be pushed to the front.

During the first week of negotiations, after the water-front employers had notified the maritime unions that they were going to open the award, the split occurred between the seamen's union and the longshoremen's group. During this period the murder of George Alberts had been discovered and the body of Cherbourg had been taken from San Francisco Bay.

On August 29 a telegram was received in Seattle from San Francisco which we introduce to this committee and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 26," from which we quote as follows:

"Party status is definitely changed. Still do not want strike but ready and willing to go through with it if necessary for radicals to retain control of maritime unions. Party prepared for long and bloody strike, although denial of firearms and ammunitions. This denial does not check with other statements. Statement made Alameda murder definitely linked with maritime situation and to expose those guilty will involve maritime union individuals to extent so great that too dangerous for informant."

On August 31, 1936, Mitchell, of the Vancouver, British Columbia, longshoremen, received the following wire from Harry Bridges:

"Word tonight from Lewis that he and his followers were with you, so if you walk out we will make it a big one. That is all we need."

On the same day Whitehead, of Seattle, phoned to Vancouver, British Columbia, that he had received a wire from Harry Bridges, reading as follows:

"Nothing can stop wide open break between employers and I. L. A. and Maritime Federation. It looks only a few days away."

Whitehead then quoted from a letter he had received from Bridges as follows:

"The men in 'Frisko do not want to take a vote on it, and say, why not tie up shipping now and let the employers come to us. With all shipping tied up tight

they will make a much better settlement than we would, so anything may happen any time, not even waiting for a vote to be taken, for the taking of a vote would go solidly for a strike."

At noon the same day Mitchell in Vancouver, British Columbia, received a wire from Bridges:

"Today, after refusing to consider offer by employers several times re wages, we agreed to put the matter before our men and the referendum at once will allow us to carry on and at the same time give us our vote to be sure where we stand."

Later in the afternoon Whitehead wired Mitchell from Seattle:

"I am instructed to inform you that you are to hold a referendum vote the same as on this side. You will receive full instructions on Wednesday or as soon as I have time to prepare them."

On September 1, 1936, Landye came into Vancouver, British Columbia, from Seattle and met the local men at the labor temple. He stated: "We expect you to get us a big vote to reject any offers. It will be in reality a strike vote. Commence voting Thursday morning and take 4 days to finish. That will be Monday, September 7, at 8 p. m. Make your report by noon of Tuesday, September 8, to reach Bridges in time for tabulation that evening in 'Frisco, then action with the employers the following day, Wednesday, September 9. The employers think it will be the middle of the month, but Bridges will fool them."

We desire to enter the confidential memorandum containing the above quotations and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 27."

On September 4 Harry Bridges informed the San Francisco Central Labor Council that he was advising the men to prepare for a strike. It was the consensus of opinion by disinterested observers at the time that when the strike vote was taken to determine whether the employers' proposals would be submitted to arbitration, that the results would depend upon the way the ballot was prepared.

At this time we offered in evidence the official longshoremen's ballot to be voted on September 10, 11, and 12, 1936, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 23."

The attention of the committee is called to the peculiar manner in which the employers' proposals are presented, together with the question as framed.

During this period the steamship *President Hoover* was tied up. We mention it at this time because it is an excellent example of the determined campaign of the Maritime Federation to destroy discipline on the American merchant ships. This was a campaign to destroy the authority of the master and other officers and to substitute committee (Soviet) rule by the crew.

Early in 1936 union officials instructed all seamen to keep a careful record of "all infractions of navigation laws and of the arbitration award and to enforce the award and the navigation laws." In other words, the crew was to replace the authority of the United States Government in law enforcement.

Open trouble developed on the *Hoover* at Honolulu on August 21, 1936. The ship was scheduled to sail at 10 p. m. At 9:30 p. m. a delegate, Bremner by name, advised Captain Yardley that the deck crew would not permit the ship to leave the dock until all hatches were battened and all gear secured. Captain Yardley advised the ship's delegate that the vessel would proceed as customary, securing gear as they sailed down the harbor, but that in event the gear was not scoured and hatches were not battened by the time the reef was reached the vessel would heave to until such work was accomplished. The captain warned the men that if they refused to work he would log them 2 days' pay for every infraction of the rules.

At sailing time, the deck crew assigned to the watches remained below. They did not report to their stations until 20 minutes later, at which time the vessel proceeded down the harbor, battening hatches and securing the gear as is customary.

In accordance with his warning, Captain Yardley logged four members of the deck crew for disobedience of orders and for delaying the United States mails, fining them 2 days' pay for each count, or a total of 4 days' pay. The vessel arrived in San Francisco at 11:30 a. m. August 26. The morning of August 27, the company started to pay off. The deck crew refused to accept their pay unless the 4 days' logging were remitted. The shipping commissioner advised the men and the captain that "a 2 days' fine for refusal to obey lawful orders of the master was correct."

Despite this, the sailors still refused and the remainder of the crew, both engine department and cooks and stewards, likewise refused to accept their pay. When the ship returned to San Francisco on September 1, Capt. John A. Rylander, United States Shipping Commissioner for San Francisco, conducted an investigation under orders from Joseph Weaver, bureau chief in Washington.

In the investigation, Brenner, who had been the ship's delegate, readily admitted that Captain Yardley had said the ship would heave to inside the reef in case hatches and gear were not secured by the time they reached the reef. "But, said Seaman Brenner, there wasn't any room to heave to inside the harbor." "How do you know," queried Captain Rylander, "have you seen the length of the harbor or do you know from personal knowledge?" "No," said Mr. Brenner, "but one of the men in the forecabin, who has officer's papers, told me so."

Delegate Brenner was not reemployed and when the *President Hoover* attempted to sail from San Francisco at 4 p. m. Friday, September 4, the members of the engine department and the cooks and stewards were signed on without difficulty, but the entire deck department refused to sign on unless Brenner was reemployed.

After the ship was tied up for 5 days and 21½ hours and with a loss of over \$50,000, the *President Hoover* finally sailed.

It is pointed out to the committee that while the money loss was negligible, the loss of prestige due to lack of discipline was inconceivably great.

We charge that the incident of the steamship *President Hoover* was inspired and controlled by a Communist nuclei on that ship.

At this time we desire to introduce to the committee a file entitled "Minutes, Joint Strike Policy Committee of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific," and request that this be marked "Exhibit No. 29."

We request the committee to note that all quotations from this file will be marked in numerical order in red pencil.

Quotation 1, September 4, 1936, page 6: "Amendment by Pyle, seconded by Rathborne, that we advise the coast committee of shipowners, the press, and all parties concerned, that if all misunderstandings now existing between the unions and employers are not settled by September 30, the maritime unions and the shipowners shall mutually agree to continue operations temporarily after October 1, under conditions now in effect with all unions until satisfactory new agreements are signed by all organizations affiliated with the maritime federation."

This amendment offered by Pyle and Rathborne, who are both Communists and members of the American Radio Telegraphers Association, was in direct line with the expressed will of the Communist Party as heretofore shown.

The party still felt that it could carry the present agreements over until April of 1937, at which time they felt that Mr. John L. Lewis and the C. I. O. would be ready to join with the maritime industries in a Nation-wide general strike.

Quotation 2 on the same page is as follows: "The firemen, sailors, and cooks negotiating committees asked to be recorded as voting 'No.'"

This shows a division already pointed out. The representatives of the seamen's union were going to have nothing to do with the policies of the Communist Party.

Harry Bridges and the Equality Hall group within the maritime federation had orders, however, that if the demands of the seamen were not granted and that if the seamen went out on strike, then they too would have to follow in the interests of unity. As the negotiations developed we shall see this group, under the leadership of Harry Bridges, continually stalling on the matter of a definite strike date.

On September 25, page 4, quotation No. 3: "Brother Bridges, I. L. A. 38, reported that his organization had received a letter from the employers offering an increase in wages, substituting an 8-hour day for the 6-hour day, and the members to work off the docks. His organization representatives were to meet the shipowners' representatives at 11 a. m. Saturday morning and further stated that his organization was willing to proceed and work for the time being under the present award."

Quotation No. 4: "Brother Bridges asked this committee to go on record that all unions request the shipowners to suspend their ultimatum for 25 days for further negotiations, beyond September 30, 1936, and that the unions remain

at work during this suspension, observing the conditions under the present agreements. Bridges, first, Canning, seconded."

Quotation No. 5: "Amendment to read '10 days and not more than 15 days.' Coester, first, Cates, seconded."

Quotation No. 6: "Brother Lundberg speaks in favor of the amendment."

This desire for an extension of the agreement on the part of Bridges and the desire for an early termination on the part of Lundberg is accentuated as negotiations proceed.

It is to be remembered by the committee that during all of this period, Roy Hudson, representative of the central committee of the Communist Party, was in San Francisco and cooperating with the Equality Hall group to see that the dicta of the Communist Party was carried out.

On September 23, 1936, the results of the membership referendum vote of the I. L. A. of the Pacific Coast on the proposal submitted by the Waterfront Employers' Association was returned. The votes in favor of the proposal were 489 and the votes against, 9,938.

It is interesting to note at this time that the I. L. A. voted on the employers' proposal and not on the question of whether the membership was willing to submit all disputed issues to arbitration.

The joint policy committee agreed upon an extension of 15 days after September 30, instead of the 25 days requested by Bridges. This in turn was accepted by the waterfront employers.

On September 29, 1936, the Maritime Commission wired the Waterfront Employers' Association requesting an extension for 60 days. This the waterfront employers refused to grant. On September 30 the Maritime Commission requested an extension for 30 days. The waterfront employers then replied that they would grant a 60-day extension provided that prior to the 15th day of October each of the unions would notify the Commission and agree that any and all disputes not settled within the 60-day period, would be submitted to arbitration before the Maritime Commission.

At a meeting of the joint strike committee of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific on October 14, 1936, Bridges suggested to the delegates that they go back to their membership and submit the proposal and put it to a referendum vote. This was just another delay in practice. Coester, speaking for the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, opposed this. Bridges states that the I. L. A. executive committee had gone over this proposal and thought that it was reasonable. As a result of this meeting a telegram was framed to be sent to the Maritime Commission, the Secretary of Labor, and President Roosevelt, from which we quote as quotation No. 7:

"Joint negotiating committee representing all maritime unions takes this means of notifying you that they have attempted to cooperate to the fullest extent with the Maritime Commission to avoid a tie-up. The present 15-day extension, granted at the request of the Commission, has resulted in great unrest on the part of our membership due to the employers' attitude in refusing bona fide negotiations. This situation has been aggravated by the Commission's latest dictatorial assumption of authority when the public and unions were looking to them to take a mutual and pacifying attitude. In view of the above the negotiating committee of the maritime unions are submitting to their membership a referendum asking full authority to order strike action midnight October 28. This action to avoid tie-up through spontaneous action by our membership and to give the Commission a chance to correct damage they have done and use their authority to settle situations peacefully. Bridges first, Cannalonga seconded."

We give now quotation No. 8, page 6: "Brother Schmidt reported on the wire and the press release, stating that the press release had already gone, but the wire was held up on the advice of Mr. Aaron Sapiro, the sailors' legal counsel.

The telegram was then amended as follows:

Quotation No. 9, page 6:

"Joint negotiating committee takes this means of notifying you that they have attempted to cooperate to the fullest extent with the Maritime Commission to avoid a tie-up. The present 15-day extension granted at the request of the Commission has resulted in great unrest on the part of our membership due to employers' attitude in refusing bona fide negotiations. This situation has been aggravated by Commission's latest assumption of authority not yet in effect

when the public and unions were looking to them to take a neutral and pacifying attitude. In view of the above and attempting to protect solely fundamental issues, unions now have and feel are jeopardized. The negotiating committee of maritime unions are submitting to their membership a referendum asking full authority to order strike action midnight October 28. This action taken to avoid tie-up through spontaneous action by our membership and to give Commission chance to correct false impression left in the minds of our members and the public have used our efforts to settle situation peaceably by mediation.

"F. M. KELLEY,

"Secretary, Joint Negotiating Committee, Maritime Federation."

We point out to the committee the difference between the first and second telegrams, indicating the usual contempt of Bridges for representatives of the United States Government.

At a meeting on October 13 the following quotation No. 10:

"Brother Bridges thinks that we should not commit ourselves to such, but should take the middle ground and watch until the Commission is actually in effect, which will be October 26, 1936. His opinion is that the proper thing for us to do is to reply that the unions agree to the extension with the provision that any benefits resulting from new agreements would be retroactive to October 1, 1936. The other alternative was to challenge the power of the Maritime Commission by inviting them to come here and show their power."

On page 6, quotation No. 11: "The committee for the proposed wire for the Maritime Commission returned and Brother Bridges reported that everybody was in accord with exception of the sailors' union."

The October 20, 1936, meeting of the joint committees appointed a committee to meet with the employers and the Commission. We cite quotation No. 12, page 1:

"Brother Bridges further states that it was his understanding that the employers had a proposal to submit to the S. U. P. It was moved and seconded that each organization elect a committee of two to accompany the I. L. A. committee to meet the employers and the Commission." The following committee was named by the respective organizations and elected by acclamation: H. Muches, W. Peel, *H. O'Neil, G. Charlot, C. W. Labelle, *H. Hook, E. Coester, D. Modin, *R. Meriwether, H. Gray, *E. O'Grady, *R. Pyle, *A. Quittenton."

As this number amounted to 13, it was agreed that the I. L. A. would supply the remaining seven, Brother Melnikow making up the 21 representatives on the committee.

We desire to point out to the committee at this time that those whose names bear asterisks were members of the Equality Hall group and also members of the Communist Party.

On October 26 the United States Maritime Commission sent the following telegram to the joint strike committee:

"Today the law creating the Maritime Commission came into full effect. All powers and authority conferred upon the commission thereby are in full force. The duties of the Commission prescribed therein as well as its authority and powers are well known to shipowners and to maritime unions of the Pacific. The Commission proposes to carry out its duties to the fullest extent of its abilities and to use all the authority and powers conferred upon it to this end. It proposes to endeavor to see to it that full justice is done to the personnel manning our ships and that the rights of both shipowner and personnel are preserved and respected. The situation confronting our merchant marines due to the disputes between shipowners and the unions on the Pacific coast is of grave public interest and of first and deep concern to the Commission. As already announced the Commission has begun an impartial investigation which will be full and complete. The Commission feels that the public interest requires that all shipping must continue to move during this investigation and repeat that it requests and expects that this will be done under latest agreement until the investigation is completed and the facts announced. You are requested to answer now unequivocally and without qualification and question are you going to respect the public and Government's interest to the extent that you will carry on under latest agreements without stoppage of work by walkout or strike until the Commission's investigation is completed and facts announced—United States Maritime Commission."

On page 3 of the October 26 minutes of the joint strike committee, quotation 13:

"Brother Curran took the floor. Reported that the east coast rank and file were going ahead with plans to support the west coast in all of its demands. Brother Curran thought some decision should be made at this time for the men on ships on both coasts such as an east coast ship being on the west coast, or a west coast ship being on the east coast in the event a strike is called."

We also give quotation No. 14 on the next page: "Brother Curran spoke about the necessity of establishing lines of communication between the east coast and the west coast."

We introduce these two quotations at this time in order that the committee may be advised that Joe Curran was on the west coast assisting Harry Bridges organize for the maritime strike of 1936. It is unnecessary for us to point out that Joe Curran's membership card in the Communist Party was introduced before this committee as evidence in its Washington, D. C. hearing.

The following telegram was then prepared and sent to the United States Maritime Commission at Washington, D. C., on October 26, 1936:

"Acknowledging your telegrams October 24 and 26. Yesterday Admiral Hamlet informed representatives maritime unions he was not here to handle present maritime crisis and his official duties are confined to full investigation merchant marine. This in answer to unions' request that hearings beginning this morning concentrate on unions' fundamental issues, protection of which would prevent strike October 28. At Commission's request unions agreed to extensions beyond September 30, again to October 26, believing Commission would act to prevent tie-up. This last-minute information from your representative that Commission is not interested in present crisis after misleading unions into belief they were has resulted in wasting much time unions could otherwise spend negotiating with those shipowners who have demonstrated they did not wish tie-up by their offering to grant full demands to some maritime unions. Your representative here abruptly adjourned hearings this morning denying either party right to make statements. The actions of Commission appear to us to coincide with the wishes of a radical minority of shipowners who apparently desire a tie-up regardless of ultimate results. Admiral Hamlet definitely notified maritime unions his investigation will be national in scope and may consume from 6 months to 1 year which would require unions to continue under present coolie wages and conditions. This same program advocated by shipowners. Unions are disturbed at such a prejudiced attitude on the part of Commission which should be impartial. We further call attention to fact that shipowners who desire avoid tieup represent large majority west coast shipping operators and are mainly nonsubsidized operators. Minority group forcing tieup are depending heavily on subsidies they hope to obtain from Commission. Justness of our position is recognized by the offer of majority group of operators. Unless fundamental issues are agreed to by October 28 for all maritime unions strike will take place midnight on that date. Public and labor generally understands and is sympathetic to cause of unions attempting to correct conditions that are un-American and to that end indicate will support us. Present returns of strike vote indicate 95 percent in favor but unions will continue cooperating with Department labor officials to use every effort toward peaceful settlement by direct negotiations.

"F. M. KELLEY,

"Secretary Joint Maritime Unions Negotiating Committee."

On October 27 the following letter was sent to the Honorable Edward F. McGrady, Assistant Secretary of Labor, by the joint strike committee:

"We are advised that the coast committee of the shipowners have agreed to resume negotiations with the unions on Wednesday, October 28. It is our hope and our desire that we may be able to reach agreements on all points in dispute.

"We request you to urge upon the coast committee of the shipowners that they concede to the respective unions so as to be immediately effective from October 28, 1936, and to remain in effect for the period of the agreement to be negotiated, to wit, 1 year: (a) Preference of employment for all unions and continuation of the present system of hiring for unlicensed personnel; (b) cash to be paid for all overtime; (c) the adjustment of the basis work day for the stewards' department, based on their request for the 8-hour day, to be worked over a span of 12 hours; (d) eight hours a day of radio work for radio operators; (e) the manning scale for licensed officers to be negotiated on the basis of the 8-hour day; (f) the continuation of the 6-hour day for the longshoremen.

"If these basic requests can be met, negotiations can be continued, and we hope a speedy understanding can be reached on all points at issue.

"Respectfully yours,

By (signed)	AMERICAN RADIO TELEGRAPHISTS' ASS'N, ROY A. PYLE, <i>Vice-President</i> . INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'N ASS'N, PACIFIC COAST DISTRICT,
By (signed)	H. R. BRIDGES. MARINE ENGINEERS' BENEFICIAL ASS'N, PACIFIC COAST DISTRICT,
By (signed)	R. MERIWETHER. MASTERS, MATES & PILOTS OF AMERICA, WEST COAST LOCAL 90,
By (signed)	E. B. O'GRADY. PACIFIC COAST MARINE FIREMEN, OILERS, WATERTENDERS & WIPERS ASS'N.,
By (signed)	HARRY GRAY. SAILORS' UNION OF THE PACIFIC,
By (signed)	HARRY LUNDEBERG. MARINE COOKS & STEWARDS OF THE PACIFIC COAST,
By (signed)	DAVID MODIN.

We now quote from the October 29 meeting of the joint strike committee:

Quotation No. 16. "Moved and seconded that we postpone for 24 hours any strike action. Brother Lundeborg speaks against motion postponed for 24 hours." "Brother Bridges speaks in favor of the motion."

This first meeting was held at 12:28 a. m. on October 29. Another meeting was called for 9 o'clock in the evening of the same day. The fight between Bridges and Lundeborg was accentuated, Bridges still desiring to carry on negotiations and Lundeborg demanding an immediate strike.

Quotation No. 17, from the minutes of this meeting, as follows: "Moved and seconded that at 11 p. m. we make the strike vote a special order of business. Bridges, first, Charlott seconded." (Both Equality Hall men.) "Amendment that this joint negotiating committee, by virtue of the power invested in them by referendum strike vote, hereby declare a strike beginning at midnight tonight on all longshore, intercoastal, and coastwise vessels; the disposition of all vessels not covered by this motion should be handled by the joint strike committee; and that all ports concerned be notified of our action prior to midnight tonight. Farrell first, Lundeborg seconded."

Following this amendment another motion was made, quotation No. 18, as follows:

"Moved and seconded that we table the motion and amendment. Schmidt first, Krumholtz seconded." It is to be noted that both Schmidt and Krumholtz belonged to the Equality Hall group.

This meant that temporarily at least the Communist Party had gained its position.

Then in quotation No. 19 we find:

"Brother Bridges stated that the fundamental demands of the I. L. A. had been granted and in the event that there is a strike the I. L. A. will not be striking for these issues."

Quotation No. 20. "Brother Bridges stated that the I. L. A. had initiated this strike vote and they were going into it with more to lose than any other organization."

Lundeborg, however, finally gained the control of the joint strike committee and the vote to strike was passed. The following telegram was sent to Joseph Curran, chairman, Seamen's Defense Committee, 164 Eleventh Avenue, New York City.

Strike declared here midnight. Negotiating committee requests support for WC for the ports insofar intercoastal ships loaded or manned by seabs are concerned. Further policy adopted here is all ships return to home port before being struck unless worked or manned by seabs. Notify other ports.

(Signed) INNES.

A newspaper in San Francisco, commenting on this situation, says as follows:

"Calling of a general maritime strike, in spite all efforts to prevent it, brought to light a new and peculiar situation, involving national politics and personal

rivalries within the unions. Harry Bridges, leader of the longshoremen for the past 3 years and district head of the maritime federation, is said to have addressed the committee meetings as late as 11 o'clock Thursday night with an impassioned plea for delay, that he was shouted down, it is reported, after Harry Lundeberg, secretary of the Sailors' Union, took the floor and insisted upon immediate action. The strike action brought the first defeat suffered by Bridges since he assumed dictatorship over the water front more than 2 years ago, and apparently points the way to a new regime in maritime labor circles. Bridges and Lundeberg have long been personal enemies, and, while the latter is as radical in his views as the former, it does not happen to be the right type of radicalism. Bridges has been playing a desperate game to retain his dictatorship over the maritime federation and swing it still further toward the left at the same time, and it is reported that after he had been talking strike for months and had succeeded in getting the authorization to call one through the federation referendum, he found that his agitation had resulted in allowing the situation to get out of hand. Roy Hudson, of New York, head of the marine section of the National Communist Party, has been in San Francisco for several days and has been in conference with Bridges."

The details of the 1936 strike were quite different from that of the general strike of 1934. There was no attempt on the part of the shipowners to operate.

Bridges and the Equality Hall group, in order to hold control of the situation, had to make an about-face. The party immediately got behind the struggle.

At this time we ask the committee to read the following articles to be found in exhibit 6-B, the Western Worker:

September 28, page 1, "Bridges replies to shipowners regarding lockout strike as he terms it."

October 1, page 1, "Place blame on shipowners for any lockout that may occur."

October 5, page 1, "Fifteen days truce proposed on water front."

October 12, page 8, "Maritime Federation District Council No. 1 gives full support to strike."

October 18, page 1, "Maritime Unions unite to take strike vote."

October 26, "I. L. A.—Stand by all sea-going crafts."

November 2, page 1, "Strike from San Diego to Alaska."

November 16, page 1, "Editorial—Demands President Roosevelt asked."

November 27, 1936, the American Citizen of San Francisco carried the following article. We quote as follows:

"The striking maritime workers, 37,000 strong on the coast alone, are prepared to hold out until April, their leaders declare, and they could have just as well gone a bit further and threatened to continue their hold-out until May 1, the International Day of Communist Revolution, when the beginning of the strike was really scheduled according to plans announced at the Congress of the Communist International at Moscow several months ago."

We quote now from the San Francisco Daily News dated July 31, 1935:

"Moscow, July 31.—A strike on a vast scale among United States longshoremen when their agreement with shipowners expires in September was predicted to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in a speech yesterday by Samuel Darcy, one of the American delegates. He said:

"The result of the struggle depends not only on the work we will carry on, on the Pacific coast; we count on the facts that through the efforts of all sections of the internationale close cooperation by seamen and port workers in all countries may be guaranteed in a general and decisive struggle against the bourgeoisie. During the San Francisco general strike we established contacts with the International Sailors' and Port Workers' Union in Australia and the Netherlands, and their fidelity and cooperation evoked tremendous enthusiasm.

"The international contacts of the working class requires special significance in connection with the danger of an imperial war."

On November 9, the Maritime Worker, mimeograph bulletin issued by the water-front section of the Communist Party in San Francisco after it succeeded the Waterfront Worker, says as follows:

"In the few years the Communist Party has been working in the marine industry, one of the most powerful maritime organizations in the world has been built up."

On November 15, Bridges spoke to the Western Writers' Congress in San Francisco, and said:

"The present maritime strike may spread to another 150,000 or 200,000 workers. We are on strike and we are going to win. I hope that the strike will not spread, but that may be necessary. We have not yet called on our reserves."

On November 21, speaking at the San Francisco Labor Council, Bridges said: "No one knows better than we do how this situation effects other workers. We know that troops and machine guns may move in here again and we know that won't be any fun. But we would rather take a crack at the machine guns than go back to conditions as they were before 1934."

Bridges then proceeded to make an attack upon the whole I. L. A. structure on the Atlantic coast and against all the leaders of the American Federation of Labor by saying:

"The I. L. A. on the Atlantic coast is a racket using 500 thugs and gangsters in smashing seamen's picket lines so longshoremen can scab on their striking brothers. They are playing the game of the shipowners and crossing the strikers back East before the shipowners move in on us here. And after this strike is over we will show them more of an inland march. I haven't heard any kicks from the boys in the front trenches of the inland march. The 1934 strike was localized. This strike is now national in scope. We have no fear. We know what the outcome will be. We expect help from the Government. Labor put this Government into office. We expect support and we are going to get it."

On December 8, 1936, a mass meeting was held in the San Francisco Municipal Auditorium where Harry Bridges entered into a debate with Mr. Roger Lapham, president of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. Those seated on the platform with Harry Bridges were Henry Schmidt, member of the Equality Hall group; Angelo Herndon, Negro Communist and national chairman of the Young Communist League; William Schneiderman, district organizer for the party; Frank Spector, party organizer for the Communist Party; Lawrence Ross, editor of the Western Worker; and Anita Whitney, State chairman of the Communist Party; E. B. O'Grady, of the Masters, Mates and Pilots Association and Equality Hall group; Jennie Matyas, Communist; and George Woolf, president of the Alaska Cannery Workers' Union, and member of the Communist Party.

The following telegram was sent by the Communist Party to the San Francisco strike committee:

"Greetings to the striking maritime workers of San Francisco and the labor movement which is giving such splendid support to your heroic struggle. The central committee of our party which has just concluded a 3-day session here has adopted a special resolution in support of your struggle and urged all of the party organizations to not only continue but multiply many times the support that we are giving to your fight. We realize that the big shipowners are trying to crush the maritime unions as a step toward a general attack on the trade-union movement and that this demand of the entire labor movement united and wholehearted support for your struggle. We realize that the victorious outcome of your struggle will be a big step in the direction of the organization of the steel workers and the millions of other organized workers in their fight for better conditions and militant trade unionism. We specially pledge ourselves to help the strike in the Atlantic and Gulf ports which makes the present maritime strike Nation-wide in character and of the greatest significance to the entire labor movement. Our central committee heard with the greatest regret the anti-working class action taken by the Tampa Convention of the American Federation of Labor, and pledged itself to bring the fight for support of the A. F. of L. members to your strike into every possible local of the A. F. or L."

At this time we request of the committee that the witnesses designated in the list pertaining to this report be called to amplify the above.

We shall now present to the committee a résumé of the situation as of December 31, 1936.

1. Declaration by Harry Bridges, district president of the International Longshoremen's Association and dictator of strike strategy for seven unions comprising the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, that the federation, or at least its strike committee, will not countenance any proposed settlements between the shipowners and individual unions—no striker will return to work until all demands of all the unions have been met.

2. Predictions by Bridges at a strikers' meeting at Wilmington on December 28 of a complete tie-up of Atlantic coast shipping within the next 2 weeks unless the striking unions on the Pacific coast win their demands.

3. New demands by the strike committee that the strike of the machinists—who are in no way connected with the Maritime Federation and are not employed by the shipowners or stevedoring firms—must be settled before peace can be had. Some 138 machinists are on strike in San Francisco and East Bay ship-yards.

4. Threats by E. B. O'Grady, spokesman for the Masters, Mates, and Pilots, that not only must shipowners agree to "preferential employment", which means closed shop, for members of the union but that all licensed officers not members of the union would be forced to join or driven off their jobs shortly after the strike ends.

5. Imposition by the Warehousemen's Union, a subsidiary of the I. L. A., of a "permit" system, whereby San Francisco businessmen are required to obtain permission from the union picketing committee to obtain their own goods, in no way involved in the maritime strike, from railroad cars or warehouses, and must have permits even to enter their own places of business.

6. Statements by the committee of shipowners that Bridges and his associates are blocking settlement of the strike by preventing the members of the two unions from voting on tentative agreements, and by making settlement on the Pacific coast contingent upon a victory of the outlaw seamen's group on the Atlantic coast.

7. Continuation of the "battle of statements," with charges and counter-charges from both sides, in the newspapers. This course had been made necessary to acquaint the public vitally concerned in settlement of the strike, with developments, and because the Bridges committee refuses to allow newspaper reporters to attend any of the conferences between the union spokesmen and the shipowners' committee.

8. Picketing of East Bay railroad yards and the destruction of alleged "hot cargo" by maritime and warehousemen's strikers.

9. Dismissal of Harry Bridges from a \$75-a-week job as organizer on the Pacific coast for the International Longshoremen's Association and from membership on the I. L. A. national executive board by President Joseph P. Ryan on charges that Bridges is disrupting the union.

10. Decree by William A. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, that the longshoremen must confine their organizational activities to the water front and marine docks, and that the organization of teamsters, warehousemen, and others on their "inland march" program was outside of their jurisdiction.

11. Threats by C. H. Jordan, secretary of the joint strike committee at San Pedro, that "there will be no settlement of the present maritime strike if the men have to return to work under the provisions of the Copeland bill" and charges that Secretary of Labor Madam Perkins had "betrayed" the maritime unions by promising that the law would not be enforced.

12. Evidences of internal dissension over conduct of the strike in the sailors' union of the Pacific and the marine firemen's union.

13. Discharge of B. Mayes as editor and members of his editorial staff of the Voice of the Federation because Mayes resisted the attempts of the Communist Party, he declares, to dictate the policy of the publication.

After a 99-day stoppage of work, the second great maritime strike came to an end on February 4, 1937, when an agreement was signed with the water-front employers of the Pacific coast.

We have given to this committee the facts surrounding it and have paid particular attention to the Communist activity in preparation for it and during it.

The events of early 1937 and the creation of the Committee for Industrial Organization show to the committee that the general strike would have been inevitable had Bridges been permitted to keep the awards closed until April 30, 1937.

At this time we desire the committee to read from Exhibit G-C, the file of the Western Worker for 1937, an article entitled, "Pre-Convention Discussion of The Lessons of The Maritime Strike by Frank Spector." This will be found on page 4, February 11, 1937; page 4, February 18, 1937; page 4, February 22, 1937; page 4, March 1, 1937; page 4, March 4, 1937; page 4, March 8, 1937; and page 8, March 11, 1937. We give the following excerpts from these sub-exhibits:

"The Pacific Coast maritime strike, which after 99 days ended in victory, has exerted an enormous influence on the whole labor movement. Its lessons are of tremendous importance to the party in facing the immediate tasks ahead of us. The party played a great role in the struggle to maintain the unity of the workers, without which the strike could not have been successful.

"IN EVERY PHASE OF STRUGGLE

"The Communists in the maritime unions, both before and during the strike, participated in every phase of the struggle, whether on the picket lines, in the various committees for organizing relief, publicity, finances, picketing, and in the leading strike committees. But more important still, the Communists in the face of red-baiting, mobilized all honest progressive forces in the unions to fight for a correct policy, and rallied the membership of the Maritime Federation, at every crucial point of the strike, against every splitting maneuver, whether on the part of the shipowners or within the unions' ranks, which threatened the success of the strike.

"One of the major factors in the success of the strike was the correct policy of the Communists and other progressive forces, in laying the basis before last September 30 for joint action of all maritime unions, by fighting for the I. L. A. to throw its support behind the seamen's demands by solidarity action on a coast-wide scale.

* * * * *

"DEFEAT OF TROTZKYITES

"Another major factor was the crushing defeat of the disruptive and splitting facts and policies of the handful of Trotzkyite disrupters, who influenced and incited the syndicalist elements among the seamen to follow a line which was an obstacle to unity and at times seriously threatened the outcome of the strike.

* * * * *

"The party carried on a campaign among the strikers for a Farmer-Labor party, linking up the maritime workers' struggles with the need for independent political action on a local, State, and national scale. * * *

"ROLE OF THE WOMEN

"Another important phase of the strike was the role of the women, particularly in the I. L. A. Auxilliary, in actively participating in the organization of relief and other phases of strike activity; and the work of the Young Communists among the youth, in organizing sports and other recreational and educational activity for the strikers around the Union Recreation Center on the water front.

"The Maritime Worker, weekly organ of the water front section of the party, and the Western Worker were indispensable weapons in the fight for maintaining the unity of the strikers and in clarifying questions of policy, as well as explaining the broader political aspects of the struggle.

"The Western Worker was distributed in thousands of copies, regularly, in the union halls and on the picket lines, and was as widely read and discussed as the Voice of the Federation, in spite of red-baiting attacks and numerous attempts to bar it from union halls.

"The role and influence of the party reflected especially in the recruiting of over 300 new members to the party from the strikers' ranks. The party organization as a whole reacted well to its tasks during the strike."

At this time we introduce two volumes of the "Maritime Worker" issued by the water-front section of the Communist Party, District 13, and request that they be marked for the year 1936, exhibit 30A, and for the year 1937, exhibit 30B.

From the end of the strike on February 4 until the time of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific convention held in Portland in June, the major emphasis on the part of Harry Bridges and the Communist Party was placed upon the "Copeland discharge book" and the task of swinging the unions of the Maritime Federation in to the Committee for Industrial Organization.

We refer the committee to the following quotations in the Maritime Worker: Volume 3, No. 8, "Unity needed in Copeland fight."

Volume 3, No. 8, page 6, "John L. Lewis and the Supreme Court."

Volume 3, No. 9, "New marine labor bill holds threats."

Volume 3, No. 11, page 6, "Bill Green tries union busting again."

Volume 3, No. 12, "What means national unity."

Volume 3, No. 13, page 2, "Heading towards unity."

Volume 3, No. 13, page 1, "Problems for the coming I. L. A. convention."

We at this time quote from volume 3, No. 13: "Mainstay of the Maritime Federation, the decisions effected by the I. L. A. convention will be of special significance in the coming federation convention, and in the fight for a national maritime federation.

"It is a far cry from the early days of 1934, when a handful of militant progressives along the Embarcadero were courageously fighting shipowners and the heartily hated 'blue-book unions'—a fight to success for the first time in years, brought the Pacific maritime workers into action.

"Let it be said here and now that despite the opinions of any individual or individuals, the rank and file seamen are well aware of the valuable role the longshoremen played in the successfully concluded 1936-37 strikes. Seamen as a whole are entirely aware of the progressive role played by the district I. L. A. leadership.

"It is because of this that the rest of the federation will look to the results of the I. L. A. convention for continued progressive leadership.

"Then to this end the rank and file longshoremen must follow the leadership which has brought them along the highway since 1934.

"On to a national maritime federation."

From volume 3, No. 18, page 2, "Convention starts Monday," we quote as follows:

"Harry Bridges, president of the I. L. A. is prepared to recommend to the convention that the district reaffirm its full support to the aims and activities of the C. I. O."

Volume 3, No. 20, page 1, "For national unity and C. I. O. affiliation."

Volume 3, No. 21, page 1, "All hands together."

Volume 3, No. 23, page 1, "The rank and file want national unity under the C. I. O.; all else is of secondary importance."

The other organ of the Communist Party, the Western Worker (see exhibit 6C) prepared the way also for Bridges to carry the Maritime Federation of the Pacific into the Committee for Industrial Organization, and we request the committee to read the following:

Volume 6, No. 21, page 1, "C. I. O. drive."

Volume 6, No. 22, page 4, "Work of Communists in the big maritime strike."

Volume 6, No. 25, page 1, "I. L. A. 35-79 assails C. I. O. expulsions."

Volume 6, No. 26, page 5, "For national unity of marine workers."

Volume 6, No. 28, page 8, "Urge national marine labor convention."

Volume 6, No. 30, page 8, "Bridges' recommendations on some vital problems before the I. L. A. members."

Volume 6, No. 34, page 8, "Radio telegraphers now in C. I. O."

Volume 6, No. 35, page 1, "I. L. A. convention in vital issues."

Volume 6, No. 38, page 1, "Seamen in new stride to national unity."

Volume 6, May 27, 1937, page 1, "Bridges, by acclamation."

Volume 6, No. 33, page 1, "National Maritime Union in unity."

Volume 6, No. 44, page 1, "Marine unions behind Ford strike."

Volume 6, No. 45, page 1, "Maritime federation convenes June 7; C. I. O. main issue."

Volume 6, No. 45, page 4, editorial "The Maritime Federation."

We charge at this time that Bridges, having failed to carry out the objectives of the Communist Party in the 1936-37 strikes, namely, to have that strike coincide with the strike in the automotive, rubber, and steel industries, did during this period, with the assistance of the other members of the Equality Hall group and the other sections of the Communist Party, by persuasion, threats, and intimidation, force the maritime unions of the Pacific into the Committee for Industrial Organization.

We maintain that a thorough perusal on the part of the committee of the articles heretofore quoted will convince the committee as to the accuracy of this contention.

The committee is now requested to examine the facts surrounding the convention of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific which opened on Monday morning, June 7, 1937, in Portland, Oreg.

Bridges had embarked upon a very dangerous move. His plan to carry the Maritime Federation of the Pacific into the Committee for Industrial Organization had to succeed or he would lose his entire power on the Pacific coast. He was well aware of the fact that if he failed the Communist Party had another leader in the person of Henry Schmidt ready to step into his shoes.

The Communist Party, however, had built Harry Bridges well in the minds of all of the longshoremen on the Pacific coast, as well as the members of the other marine unions. It was natural, therefore, that the greatest concentration of Communist Party functionaries that ever took place on the Pacific coast started at Portland, Oreg., at this time.

At the time of convening the party expected little opposition and felt that the program could be rushed through in about 10 days, but when the opposition developed the convention dragged on for 29 days, with the Communist leaders losing ground every day.

Early in January the Communist Party had succeeded in ousting Barney Mayes as editor of *The Voice* of the Federation and had replaced him with O'Neil, whom they knew would take party instructions. From that time until the convention the Communist Party was in a position to censure every news release which reached the rank and file. They were also enabled to direct "quickie" strikes from committee rooms, as every issue that came before the rank and file was referred to the committees controlled by the party.

At this time we refer the committee to exhibit No. 29, "Minutes of the joint policy strike committee of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific," wherein the committee will see that it was Harry Bridges who introduced the resolution to have Barney Mayes ousted from his position.

Among the Communist Party leaders and sympathizers in Portland during the convention were the following:

John Brophy, at one time accused by John L. Lewis as being a paid agent of the Soviet Government, now officially representing Lewis as managing director of the C. I. O.; Harry Bridges, an alien and member of the Communist Party under an alias; Henry Schmidt, a member of the Communist Party and president of the I. L. A. Local 38-44 of San Francisco; Walter Lambert, member of the Communist Party in charge of all industrial units of the party on the Pacific coast; Arthur Scott, membership director of the California district (district No. 13) of the Communist Party; John Schomaker, California Communist acting as a reporter for the Communist editor of the *Voice* of the Federation; Bill Schneiderman, secretary of the Thirteenth District Communist Party; Harry Jackson, alias Morris Rapport, district organizer of the northwest district (district No. 12) of the Communist Party; Jim O'Neil, Communist editor of the *Voice* of the Federation who was fired during the convention; Joe Curran, Communist, east coast lieutenant of Bridges; James R. Maskell, Canadian Communist and delegate from the Inland Boatmen's Union; E. V. Denneff, Canadian Communist and delegate from the Inland Boatmen's Union; Paul Heide, California Communist and delegate from I. L. A. Local 38-44; V. Sharkey, California Communist and delegate from I. L. A. Local 38-44; Leo D. Hemingway, Portland Communist and member of the Warehousemen's Union; Harry Gross, Portland attorney for the International Labor Defense and the Warehousemen's Union; Jim Murphy, organizer for the Portland section of the Communist Party; Bob Adams, Portland Communist and member of the I. L. A.; John Brost, Communist sympathizer; Harold Pritchett, Canadian Communist and president of the Woodworkers' Federation; O. M. Orton, Aberdeen Communist active in the Woodworkers' Federation and C. I. O. movement; and others.

Harry Bridges registered at the Multnomah Hotel on his arrival in Portland. On Tuesday morning, June 8, he held an important conference with Walter Lambert in his hotel room.

At this time we ask the committee to consider why it was necessary for Bridges to hold a conference with Walter Lambert, who, while a member of the Communist Party in charge of all industrial units on the Pacific coast, had nothing to do with the Maritime Federation.

On June 15, 1937, a lieutenant of the Portland police department's detective division, made the following confidential report to his captain:

"Sir: A top fraction of the Communist Party of the United States, was held in room 314 of the Sherman Hotel, this city, at 4:30 p. m., June 14, 1937. Those attending were party members representing the 12th and 13th districts of the party. The following are the names and connections of the party members attending the fraction meeting and are listed as to their rang and party

standing: 1. Walter Lambert, head of the industrial unit of the Pacific coast; 2. Arthur Scott, head of the professional section and head of membership; 2A. Harry Bridges, I. L. A., San Francisco, 13th district; 3. Harry Gross, attorney and legal advisor International Labor Defense; 4. Henry Schmidt (or Schmitt) president I. L. A. 38-44, San Francisco, Calif.; 5. John Shoemaker, I. L. A. 38-44, San Francisco; 6. Bob Moore, I. L. A., whsm. 38-44, San Francisco, Calif.; 7. ? , Cohen & Green, connection unknown, thought to be with S. U. P.

"The meeting was held in the room of the above-named John Shoemaker. Schmidt lives in the room next door to this room at the Sherman Hotel.

"The afternoon was taken up with a discussion of the reported finding of a bug or mike or as the newspapers say a squealer in the room of Bridges at the Multnomah Hotel. Second subject was that Bridges intends to fly to Chicago to meet John L. Lewis regarding an investigation by the La Follette committee to find the person responsible for the wiring of Bridges' room and the theft of credentials and other papers from that room. Bridges stated he would leave Portland by air on Tuesday, June 15.

"Third subject was a slate of party members and sympathizers to be elected the new officers of the Marine Federation of the Pacific. The slate is as follows:

"For president: James Engstrom, president, membership, Marine Firemen, Water Tenders and Oilers. Sympathizer.

"Vice president: E. B. O'Grady, secretary, Master, Mates and Pilots, M. F. of P. Sympathizer.

"Secretary: Herman Stuyvelaar. Member of the Communist Party of the U. S."

Plans for discouraging conservative leaders, rejecting resolutions not drawn up by the party, nominating and supporting officers sympathetic to the Communists' program, and the launching of agitation and propaganda to insure the delegates' support of the C. I. O. were among the things discussed and decided upon at the fraction meeting.

The convention, however, voted against affiliation of the C. I. O. and left this matter to a referendum vote.

There is no question that the maritime federation was unanimously in favor of an industrial form of unionism both in principle and in spirit, believing that it was a more efficient tool in the hands of labor for bettering hours, wages, and working conditions. The federation, however, was not willing to give up what it already had gained under the American Federation of Labor for just a promise of something better under the C. I. O., particularly when that promise came from the Communist control leadership.

On Wednesday afternoon, June 9, Brophy took the stand for 4½ hours while the federation delegates fired questions at him regarding the C. I. O. At that time the delegates could not be sure that the C. I. O. would keep its promises. Brophy went to great length to assure the delegates that these promises would be kept.

We now refer the committee back to the original list of the Equality Hall group and request them to observe who it was of this group that introduced the following resolutions of the maritime federation which we will now quote.

A resolution was introduced by Jim O'Neil and Paul Heide, both Communists, to have the federation go on record as endorsing the financial drive of the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, to form special subcommittees in each district council to cooperate with the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, and to "go on record in full support of the Spanish workers and fellow trade unions who are waging a life-and-death struggle in defense of democracy and against fascism."

The King-Ramsey-Connor defense committee of the maritime federation introduced a resolution stating, "Whereas these men have been convicted on a framed charge of murder, and whereas their conviction was secured by an unholy alliance between the shipowners and district attorney, Earl Warren, of Alameda County, Calif., mouthpiece for the banker controlled, reactionary California Republican machine, who banded together to conceal truth, defeat justice, and imprison three union leaders whose only crime was efficiency in raising wages and bettering working conditions, therefore be it resolved, that the maritime federation in convention here assembled, hereby affirms its belief in the innocence of these men and determination to lend every support to the fight for their freedom."

Henry Schmidt introduced a resolution for the federation to continue its 100-percent support for the freedom of Mooney and Billings.

Henry Schmidt and John Schomaker submitted a resolution to establish a "junior union movement," and the establishment of summer camps for the children.

Just as the Communist Party injected parts of the party's program into the convention through resolutions formulated at its various fraction meetings, which Harry Bridges also attended, they also selected candidates for the various offices of the federation.

Among the candidates selected at the Communists' fraction meetings were James Engstrom, for president, and E. B. O'Grady, for vice-president.

As previously stated, the longer the convention met the stronger the opposition to the party program became. Fearing the conservative elements might check all control from party leaders by electing men opposed to communism, Bridges was given instructions to break up the federation, should the opposition gain complete control. The Communists' plan in this case was to break up the federation if they could not control it and then build the C. I. O. from the fragments.

Being aware of this plan and knowing that Bridges would break up the federation under these circumstances, the conservative elements withdrew William Fischer from the race for president at the last minute and allowed Engstrom to be elected. It was felt that with Engstrom at the head of the federation the Communist Party would not dare break it up after building Engstrom up for the past 2 years and finally putting him in office.

We now offer to the committee a folio of telegrams sent and received at Portland, Oreg., during the 1937 convention, and request that this folio be marked "Exhibit No. 31."

We shall not quote openly in this report regarding the contents of the telegrams, but request the committee at this time to call the witnesses designated in the list appended to this report, to explain their contents.

A quotation taken, however, from a San Francisco newspaper dated June 21, 1937, will explain the meaning at least of some of these telegrams.

We quote from the American Citizen of June 21, 1937:

"Assuming that the Communist members who were delegates from the maritime unions to the convention had a right to be there, perhaps Bridges can explain why it was necessary that such men as Bill Schneiderman, Walter Lambert, and Harry Jackson met with him in Portland. These men do not belong to any union affiliated with the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. Perhaps it would be pertinent to ask Bridges the necessity of the important conference he held with Walter Lambert in his hotel room on Tuesday morning, June 8, especially since it is known that Mr. Lambert does not belong to anything except the Communist Party. And why does John Brophy, former bitter enemy and now chief aide of John L. Lewis, in the C. I. O., have to meet with Bridges and other members of the Communists who were not connected with the Maritime Federation?"

"The reporter found Roy Pyle and Jack Von Erman registered in adjoining rooms of the Lennox Hotel and John Schomaker, Bill Schneiderman, Walter Lambert, and Henry Schmidt registered right next door at the Sherman Hotel. It was interesting to observe the getting together of certain individuals and groups which unequivocally pointed out the work that the Communist Party was doing to further the aims and objectives of Bridges. And, of course, the reporter had no reason for knowing anything about the 'party discipline' Mr. Bridges was subjected to during the first week of the convention.

"It was interesting to note that Jim O'Neil, editor of the Voice of the Federation, received instructions from Mr. Kelly, secretary of the federation, not to accept any more news releases from John Schomaker. (We call the attention of the committee to the telegrams). But of course Mr. Kelly did not know of the party connection between O'Neil and Schomaker, a connection which neither Mr. Kelly nor anyone else who is not a Communist can break or influence, and he may be still unaware until he reads this, that in spite of his injunction, John Schomaker continued in constant contact with O'Neil and supplied him with several news stories.

"It was interesting to note the helpfulness of Joe Curran, the east coast red trouble maker, in assisting Bridges arrange the preliminary phases of the Portland convention. And it is understood that a lot of the members of the Maritime Federation unions would be very much interested in the deal Bridges is said to have made with Curran and certain other interests to 'putting the skids under Ryan,' international president of the I. L. A.

"From what he was able to pick up about the convention held in the hotels, the Portland reporter ventures to predict that if Bridges is given control of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific as a result of the referendum voting it into the C. I. O., John Lewis will appoint Bridges as the C. I. O. director for the Pacific coast, with power to appoint some two hundred organizers. This would mean that a majority of these organizers will be members of the Communist Party as Communist sympathizers. It is further rumored that the C. I. O. will grant Bridges some \$30,000 to organize the agricultural workers of California under the C. I. O. All of which moves the American Citizen to quote the ancient observation that 'There are none so blind as those who will not see,' and to suggest to the non-Communist members of the Maritime Federation unions that they should awake and get busy forthwith, 'less they find themselves the unwilling tools of a foreign organization.'"

At this time we request the committee to call the witnesses indicated in the list appended to this report for substantiation of the above.

Despite the fact that the Maritime Federation of the Pacific had referred the matter of affiliating with the Committee for Industrial Organization to a referendum, Bridges was appointed west coast director for the C. I. O.

While Bridges made speeches up and down the coast, the two Communist west coast papers started their campaign to back him up. The Western Worker (see Exhibit 6-C, vol. 6, No. 56, page 1) bore an editorial under the caption, "Maritime Rank and File Are for the C. I. O."

The following issue, No. 57, makes the following statement:

"Appointment of Harry Bridges by the committee for industrial organization as west coast C. I. O. director carries with it general supervision over organizing activities and drives of the C. I. O. unions and unification and consolidation of the C. I. O. forces for the entire coast, it has been learned.

"MARITIME FEDERATION FIRST TASK

"Bridges' first and most pressing task will be the unification of the maritime unions into a national maritime federation under the C. I. O. charter.

"It is expected that C. I. O. regional headquarters will be set up at the most important west coast centers.

"Bridges is calling a special meeting of the Pacific coast I. L. A. district executive board in Portland, this Sunday, to take the necessary steps to carry out the will of the I. L. A. membership as expressed in the overwhelming vote of C. I. O. affiliation. The board will probably make immediate application for an international charter under the C. I. O. Bridges is going east to attend the American Radio Telegraphers' Association convention in New York, early in August, and the Seamen's National Unity conference in Chicago on August 16th."

Shortly after this announcement was made, another announcement was made in the Monday, July 26th, issue of the Western Worker, which showed specifically the Communists' domination over the maritime workers under Harry Bridges.

We quote:

"In one of the most sensational protests won by American workers against the intervention of 'Nazi Germany,' and 'Fascist Italy' in Spain, all west coast ships will be struck for one-half hour on August 2nd, at 2:00 p. m.

"Preparations are under way up and down the coast for the stoppage of work. The tieup was ordered by the recently concluded convention of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, held in Portland."

By the end of July, the I. L. A., the American Radio Telegraphers' Association, and the national maritime unions had affiliated with the C. I. O.

The Western Worker claimed that the west coast sailors, firemen, and cooks and stewards, had voted overwhelmingly to go C. I. O. in their referendum vote and claimed that the Sailors' Union and the Marine Firemen officials had ignored that vote.

We refer the committee to this article on the first page under the heading "C. I. O. Means National Maritime Unity."

By October the following maritime federations had gone C. I. O.: Longshoremen and all affiliated crafts; cooks and stewards; inland boatmen; Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; American Radio Telegraphers' Association. This constituted over 75 percent of the Pacific coast maritime federations.

In September a charter was granted by the Committee for Industrial Organization to the International Longshoremen's Association under the name of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. Harry Bridges was elected president of this organization, Walter Mahaffey, vice-president, and Matt Meehan, secretary.

This put in two the equality group out of the three officers of the district organization.

On September 27, 1937, the local International Longshoremen's Association, 38-79, in San Francisco, was granted its charter from the Committee for Industrial Organization as 1-10.

At that time the following officers were elected: Henry Schmidt, president; Germain Buleke, vice-president; A. L. McCurdy, secretary; George Arns, treasurer; John Schomaker and John Larson as business agents; J. Sauters, Pete Aquilina, Ed. English, Charles Waugaman, Bill Clark, Alex Waters, as dispatchers; and Pat O'Hannigan and Johnny O'Connor as masters-at-arms.

This put the Waterfront Employers' Association in the peculiar position of being under contract with the International Longshoremen's Association and having the contracts actually carried out by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, a C. I. O. affiliate.

There also arose another difficulty in that the locals of the I. L. A. at Tacoma, Anacortes, Olympia, and Port Angeles, all in the State of Washington, had refused to affiliate with the C. I. O.

A demand was almost immediately made upon the Waterfront Employers' Association to change the name in the contracts to the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, but this they could not do because no ruling as to jurisdiction had been handed down by the National Labor Relations Board.

The Sailors' Union of the Pacific had affiliated with the Maritime Federation of the Pacific for a time, but later withdrew and did not go into the C. I. O. organization.

The National Labor Relations Board finally took up the question as to whom the contract should be given and who should constitute the collective bargaining agency of the longshoremen of the Pacific coast.

Despite resentment on the part of Joseph Ryan, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, and the American Federation of Labor, after a hearing, the National Labor Relations Board on June 23, 1938, granted jurisdiction to the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union as collective bargaining agents.

On July 13, 1938, the Waterfront Employers' Association finally agreed to substitute International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union for the International Longshoremen's Association, and stated that they would treat the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union as the sole representative for the purpose of collective bargaining of all longshoremen who worked for the members of the Waterfront Employers' Association of Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and southern California.

At this time we desire to offer the agreement between the Waterfront Employers' Association and the International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union as a memorandum dated July 15, 1938, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 32." We quote this agreement:

"The longshore agreements of February 4, 1937, are amended by substituting the name of the I. L. W. U. for I. L. A. in all places where I. L. A. appears as to all ports on the Pacific coast in which the longshoremen indicated a preference for the I. L. W. U. in the proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board, to wit: All Pacific coast ports except Olympia, Tacoma, Port Angeles, and Anacortes, in which ports the said agreements will remain unchanged, except as to such modifications or amendments as may be agreed to by the employers and the I. L. W. U. to take effect after September 30, 1938.

"It is also agreed that as to said four ports last mentioned if and when at any time before September 30, 1938, the National Labor Relations Board shall certify, on the basis of a check-off or consent election to which the undersigned associations will agree, that the International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union has been designated as exclusive representative for collective bargaining purposes of longshoremen employed by members of said associations in any of such ports, then the foregoing amendment will be extended to include the same.

"The International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, District No. 1, is recognized as the representative of all longshoremen who do longshore work in such Pacific coast ports as are covered by existing longshore agreements to which said employers' associations are parties, as their representative for purposes of collective bargaining, and that, pursuant to the provision of section IX (a) of the act, the International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, District No. 1, is the exclusive representative of all such workers for

the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, and other conditions of employment.

"WATERFRONT EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC COAST,
"By ALMON E. ROTH.

"On behalf of: Waterfront Employers' Association of San Francisco; Waterfront Employers' Association of Southern California; Waterfront Employers' of Seattle; Waterfront Employers of Portland; Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast.

"Accepted and approved:

"INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S & WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION,

"District No. 1, 593 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

"MATT MEEHAN,

"WALTER MAHAFFEY,

"HENRY SCHMIDT."

It is not to be assumed by the committee that the execution of the February 4, 1937, agreement with the International Longshoremen's Association, or the fact that the International Longshoremen's Association was taken into the C. I. O., made any change in the attitude of these unions toward living up to contract obligations.

We give now a summary of the violations of the basic longshore agreement of February 4, 1937, from that date to July 12, 1938:

(1) Jurisdictional:	
(a) Sailors_____	21
(b) Others_____	6
(2) Hot Cargo_____	12
(3) Standby time_____	6
(4) Control working conditions:	
(a) Loads_____	9
(b) More men_____	16
(5) Refusal to go through picket lines_____	33
(6) Concerning hiring hall and dispatching practices_____	10
(7) Safety_____	2
(8) Unclassified_____	48
(9) To force unionization_____	3
Total violations_____	166

These violations continued even with the prospect of a new contract for the year September 1938 to September 1939. The will of Harry Bridges and the Equality Hall group still remained paramount.

On July 12, 1938, the Waterfront Employers' Association offered to agree to formal recognition of the I. L. & W. U. as a party to the future longshore contract. They suggested that negotiations between the Waterfront Employers' Association and the I. L. W. U. District No. 1, relative to wages, hours, and conditions for longshoremen after September 30, 1938, should begin immediately.

On September 15, 1938, the agreement was tentatively made effective October 1, 1938, subject to a referendum. There were no changes in the wages or working conditions. The wage scale being as follows: 95¢ per hour for regular time and \$1.40 per hour for overtime, with penalty wage scales up to \$2 per hour.

The agreement also placed in the hands of the local National Labor Relations Board the right to inflict punishment. It created an arbitrator in each major port, i. e. Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, and also a permanent arbitrator for the whole Pacific coast.

* * * * *

We have now presented to this committee in narrative form, a picture of the activity of the Communist Party in the maritime industry of the Pacific Coast. We believe that this brief, the documentary evidence and the testimony of the witnesses have proved to the committee beyond any reasonable doubt that the Communist Party, through its agents, has had complete control of the maritime industry on the Pacific coast for the past 5 years.

We believe that the Communist Party and its agents have used the maritime industry of the Pacific coast to further a seditious conspiracy, and that the facts herein stated constitute adequate grounds for the United States Government to proceed against the leaders of the Communist Party involved and those affiliated with them in carrying out their instructions.

We therefore request the committee to place these facts before the Attorney General of the United States to the end that he may take the necessary action.

Mr. NIMMO. I think it might be well, Mr. Chairman, to have the basic brief introduced as exhibit No. 1, as a part of the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well; that will be marked "Exhibit No. 1." (The brief referred to was marked "Knowles Exhibit No. 1, October 24, 1938," and reads as follows:)

(KNOWLES EXHIBIT No. 1, OCT. 24, 1938)

BASIC BRIEF

RADICAL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA
THE AMERICAN LEGION

IN THE MATTER OF THE ULTIMATE AIMS AND ACTIVITY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

SEPTEMBER 1, 1938.

FOREWORD

The radical research committee, department of California, the American Legion, presents this brief to the investigating committee as a compilation of proof from Communist Party officials documents and publications that the Communist Party of the United States of America seeks to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

The argument in the brief is supported by extracts from documents and publications of the Communist Party, all of which are offered in their original form as exhibits, a list thereof being attached.

This is the basic document upon which all collateral proof shall rest. It will be augmented by briefs covering Communist Party activity in specific fields. These briefs will cite and present their own documentary exhibits.

All briefs, including this basic one, will be further supported by the testimony of credible witnesses who will be presented at the proper time.

We have divided this brief into seven specific points.

IN THE MATTER OF THE ULTIMATE AIMS AND ACTIVITY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY
IN THE UNITED STATES

INTRODUCTION

The Constitution of the United States, the fundamental law of the land, provides the orderly, American way for progress in government. It reserves the citizens' right to change that basic law as they, in their conscience and judgment, decide may be necessary. That traditional American principle must not be denied. Democracy demands only that we shall proceed and progress in an orderly way, every member reserving to himself the inalienable right to support or oppose changes as he sees fit.

That utterances inciting to the overthrow of organized government by unlawful means present a sufficient danger of substantive evil to bring their punishment within the range of legislative discretion is clear. Such utterances, by their very nature, involve danger to the public peace and to the security of the state and to the safety of the people. They threaten breaches of the peace and ultimate revolution. The state cannot reasonably be required to measure the danger from every such utterance in the nice balance of a jeweler's scale. It cannot be said that the state is acting arbitrarily or unreasonably when it exercises its judgment as to the measures necessary to protect the public peace and safety. It cannot reasonably be required to defer the adoption of measures for its own peace and safety until the revolutionary utterances lead to actual disturbances of the public peace or imminent and immediate danger of its own destruction; but it may, in the exercise of its judgment, suppress the threatened danger in its incipency.

The advocacy for the purpose of bringing about the destruction of organized parliamentary Government, of mass industrial revolts usurping the functions of municipal government, political mass strikes directed against the parliamentary State, and revolutionary mass action for its final destruction, necessarily implies the use of force and violence, and in its essential nature is inherently unlawful in a constitutional government of law and order.

The freedom of speech and of the press, which is secured by the Constitution, does not confer an absolute right to speak or publish, without responsibility, whatever one may choose, or an unrestricted and unbridled license that gives immunity for every possible use of language, and prevents the punishment of those who abuse this freedom.

It is a fundamental principle that a State may punish those who abuse the constitutional freedom of speech by utterances inimical to the public welfare, tending to corrupt public morals, incite to crime, or disturb the public peace.

It is a basic principle that a State may punish utterances endangering the foundations of organized government, and threatening its overthrow by unlawful means.

The right of all nations to maintain their present form of government cannot be denied. We have no quarrel with Russia because of the fact that they have a Soviet form of government. It is their own business whether their government is good or bad. It is a fundamental principle that a government may be as bad as the people themselves desire, but our interest as American citizens begins and ends with the attempts of a foreign government to force its principles upon America.

We quote the Supreme Court of the United States in *Milwaukee Publishing Company v. Burleson*, 255 U. S. 407: "Freedom of the press may protect criticism and agitation for modification or repeal of laws, but it does not extend to protection of him who counsels and encourages the violation of the law as it exists. The Constitution was adopted to preserve our Government, not to serve as a protecting screen for those who, while claiming its privileges, seek to destroy it."

In looking over the situation in Europe today we find nothing to show us any elimination of wastes or better housing or security to workers or farmers or old age that we cannot do better under democracy if we will. We have little need for confirmation in our faith, and let us hope this Nation may keep its anchors firmly grounded in intellectual liberty and spiritual freedom. These values can be preserved only by keeping Government from the pitfall of direction or participation of dictatorship.

Our democracy must sternly repress, by due process of law, but not by edict, every abuse of liberty and honesty.

The protection of democracy is that we live it, that we revitalize it within our own borders, that we keep it clean of infections, that we wipe out its corruptions, that we incessantly fight its abuses, that we insist upon intellectual honesty, that we build its morals, that we build out future along the principles as laid down by the founding fathers of the Republic.

If we do this, we can give no greater service to the future of humanity.

Communism means violence, revolution, civil war.

Make no mistake about that.

The fundamental doctrine in the Communist creed is the overthrow of existing institutions by force.

Lenin himself stated that in so many words.

His adherents in Russia and elsewhere in Europe have practiced it, are practicing it, and will continue to practice it.

First comes the period of preparation—by propaganda, by boring from within, by using social, educational, and even religious organizations to spread the germs of Communist philosophy.

Then, action and bloodshed.

It is a simple formula, now being carried out in Europe before the eyes of America, and now well advanced in its first phase here.

Many things in America need changing: things that served well in the past are outworn. With the growth of this country new needs have come. We are faced with heavy tasks and problems in going ahead with the development of America. The Communists move with a desire to blast away the fruits of the labor, toil, and sacrifices of the generations which have gone before. Upon the wreckage and ruin, they would attempt to create a fairyland or Utopia.

There is no short cut to a better America. The path is confused by difficult, many-sided problems. The way does not lie over the ruins of the things that

have made America great, but rather by continuous study and strong-hearted labor, building patiently on the work of those who have preceded us, where the work is sound, and replacing it where found faulty; replacement to be by methods provided by the Constitution.

Slowly but surely the people of the United States are beginning to realize the priceless value of the Constitution of the United States and the danger of carelessly departing from its spirit and purpose.

The Comintern has two parallel policies—one, which is an undercover program, following the Communist International's stated line for revolutionary overthrow of all capitalist governments; and the other, a smoke screen for public consumption. The latter program is so that service clubs, club women, lay church people, student bodies, intelligentsia, professional groups, inept bureaucrats, and politicians can support the Communist program under "united front" slogans and also as a protection against deportation.

The Communist Party is ready at any moment to adopt any new strategy or tactic which will advance the ultimate aim of the Comintern. This whole new strategy amounts to a clever smoke screen since the main line will not be broken but will be carried on under cover. This new development is proven beyond any doubt by the Party's literature, the Communist International congresses and the party convention plus other important sectional and secret meetings.

This brief has been prepared with the purpose in mind of stating the facts as they are without any attempt to color the facts by viewing with alarm, red baiting, riding professional martyrs on a rail, or vain-glorious flag waving. When this brief is read through, no one will have any doubt that the ultimate aim of the Communist Party is to overthrow the American Government by force and violence.

I. THE COMMUNIST PARTY

A call was issued for the organization of Communist Parties throughout the world and their adhesion in the Communist International immediately after the creation of the Communist International at Moscow in March 1919. A call for a national convention for the purpose of organizing a Communist Party in America, mailed out of Chicago, Ill., was issued July 7, 1919, over the signatures of the following individuals: Dennis E. Batt, D. Elbaum, O. C. Johnson, John Kerscher, S. Kopnagel, I. Stilson, Alexander Stoklitsky.

The call to this meeting read as follows and is quoted from volume I, part I, of *Revolutionary Radicalism*, better known as the Lusk report, page 739, exhibit I.

"CALL FOR A NATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE PURPOSE OF ORGANIZING A COMMUNIST PARTY IN AMERICA

"In this, the most momentous period of the world's history, capitalism is tottering to its ruin. The proletariat is straining at the chains which bind it. A revolutionary spirit is spreading throughout the world. The workers are rising to answer the clarion call of the Third International.

"Only one socialism is possible in this crisis. A socialism based upon understanding. A socialism that will express in action the needs of the proletariat. The time has passed for temporizing and hesitating. We must act. The Communist call of the Third International, the echo of the Communist manifesto of 1848, must be answered.

"The national executive committee of the Socialist Party of America has evidenced by its expulsion of nearly half of the membership that they will not hesitate at wrecking the organization in order to maintain control. A deadlock has been precipitated in the ranks of revolutionary socialism by the wholesale expulsion or suspension of the membership comprising the Socialist Party of Michigan, locals and branches throughout the country, together with seven language federations. This has created a condition in our movement that makes it manifestly impossible to longer delay the calling of a convention to organize a new party. Those who realize that the capturing of the Socialist Party as such is but an empty victory will not hesitate to respond to this call and leave the right and center to sink together their revolutionary leaders.

"The majority of the delegates to the left-wing conference in New York meekly neglected to sever their connections with the reactionary national executive committee. Rendered impotent by the conflicting emotions and lack of understanding present they continued to mark time as centrists in the wake of the

right. Their policy is one of endeavor to capture the old party machinery and the stagnant elements who have been struggling for a false unity and who are ready to abandon the ship when it sinks beneath the waves of reaction.

"This party will be founded upon the following principles:

"1. The present is the period of the dissolution and collapse of the whole capitalist world system; which will mean the complete collapse of world culture, if capitalism with its unsolvable contradictions is not replaced by communism.

"2. The problem of the proletariat consists in organizing and training itself for the conquest of the powers of the state. This conquest of power means the replacement of the state machinery of the bourgeoisie with a new proletarian machinery of government.

"3. This new proletarian state must embody the dictatorship of the proletariat, both industrial and agricultural, this dictatorship constituting the instrument for the taking over of property used for exploiting the workers, and for the reorganization of society on a Communist basis.

"Not the fraudulent bourgeois democracy—the hypocritical form of the rule of the finance-oligarchy, with its purely formal equality—but proletarian democracy based on the possibility of actual realization of freedom for the working masses; not capitalist bureaucracy, but organs of administrations which have been created by the masses themselves, with the real participation of these masses in the government of the country and in the activity of the Communistic structure—this should be the type of the proletarian state. The workers' councils and similar organizations represent its concrete form.

"4. The dictatorship of the proletariat shall carry out the abolition of private property in the means of production and distribution, by transfer to the proletarian state under Socialist administration of the working class; nationalization of the great business enterprises and financial trust.

"5. The present world situation demands the closest relation between the revolutionary proletariat of all countries.

"6. The fundamental means of the struggle for power is the mass action of the proletariat, a gathering together and concentration of all its energies; whereas methods such as the revolutionary use of bourgeois parliamentarianism are only of subsidiary significance."

We now introduce Report No. 2290 United States House of Representatives and request that it be marked as "Exhibit 2."

Communism repudiates parliamentarianism as a form of the future; it renounces the same as a form of the class dictatorship of the proletariat; it repudiates the possibility of winning over the parliaments; its aim is to destroy parliamentarianism. Therefore, it is only possible to speak of utilizing the bourgeois state organizations with the object of destroying them. The question can be discussed only and exclusively on such a plane.

We now quote from the Theses, Statutes, and Conditions of Admission to the Third International and ask that it be marked "Exhibit 3."

"One should not use the argument that parliament is a bourgeois institution. The Communist Party enters such institutions not for the purpose of organization work but in order to blow up the whole bourgeois machinery and the parliament itself from within.

"If the Communists have the majority in the local government institutions, they must: (A) Carry on a revolutionary opposition against the bourgeois central authority; (B) do all for the aid of the population (economic measures, establishment or attempt to establish an armed workers' militia).

"The election campaign must be carried on not in the sense of obtaining a maximum of votes, but in that of a revolutionary mobilization of the masses around the mottoes of the proletarian revolution.

"The Communist Party can only recommend a revolutionary use of the parliament as exemplified by Karl Liebkacht, Haeglund, and the Bolsheviks."

Communist Party members may be elected to offices in any department of the Government, for the local or national is given strict instructions and has a rigid line to follow, as set forth in the Theses, Statutes, and Conditions of Admission to the Third International.

A Communist delegate by decision of the central committee is bound to combine lawful work with unlawful work. In countries where the Communist delegate enjoys a certain inviolability, this must be utilized by way of rendering assistance to illegal organizations and for the propaganda of the party.

Each Communist member is taught to remember that he is not a legislator who is bound to seek agreements with the other legislators but an agitator for the party, detailed to the enemies' camp in order to carry out the orders

of the party there. The Communist member is answerable, not to the wide mass of his constituents, but to his own Communist Party, whether lawful or unlawful.

This action described by the Communist Party for its members who may be elected to State legislatures, to Congress, or any law-making body is set out in the Communist publication, *Why Communism*, by Olgin.

"We go to the law-making institutions, not to tinker them up for the benefit of the capitalists, but to put a monkey wrench in the machinery, preventing them from working smoothly in behalf of their masters."

We now introduce *Why Communism*, and request that it be marked "Exhibit 4."

A member of the party can be every person from the age of 18 up who accepts the program and rules of the Communist International, and of the Communist Party of the United States of America, who becomes a member of a basic unit of the party, who is active in this organization, who subordinates himself to all decisions of the Communist International and the Communist Party, and regularly pays his membership dues.

Members of the party who desire to leave the country must obtain the permission of the central committee of the party.

Party questions are to be discussed by the members of the party and by the party organizations until such time as a decision is taken upon them by the competent party committees or organizations. After a decision has been taken by the congress of the committee of the Communist International, by a convention of the Communist Party, or by leading committees of the Comintern and the Communist Party, these decisions must be unreservedly carried out even if a part of the party membership, or of the local party organizations are in disagreement with it.

Charges against individual members may be made either in the nuclei of the party, or in and by any leading committee or control commission of the party.

Disciplinary actions of the section committee (including actions of nuclei approved by them) must be reported promptly to the district committee.

We hereby introduce a Communist Party membership book to show that the above facts are contained in the rules and bylaws of the Communist Party of the United States of America and request that it be marked "Exhibit 5."

Anyone who has attempted to violate the iron discipline of the Communist Party by any kind of fractional activity has learned what is meant by Communist discipline as taught by Lenin and Stalin.

The party stands above everything.

The party discipline is observed by the party members and party organizations because only those who agree with the program of the Communist Party, United States of America, and the Communist International can become members of the party.

It is clear that the basic principles and decisions, such as, for example, the program of the Communist Party, cannot be questioned in the party.

It is impossible to imagine the discussion, for example, questioning the correctness of the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution, or the necessity for the proletariat dictatorship. No member of the party can question the theory of the necessity for the forceful overthrow of the class struggle laid down by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin.

The party discipline is based upon what the party is pleased to call class-consciousness of its members; upon the conviction that without the subordination of the lower party organizations to the higher committees, there can be no strong, solid, steeled party able to lead the proletariat.

The members are taught that the Communist Party is the general staff in a class war. This war is bitter, the enemy is powerful. The Communist Party literature is full of statements, but there is only one way to combat and to defeat this powerful enemy. The army of the proletariat must have a highly skilled trained general staff (the Communist Party) which is united in action as one will.

How can the army fight against the army of an enemy if every soldier in the army is allowed to question and even disobey orders of his superior officer? What would happen in a war, if for example, the general staff orders an attack, and one section of the army decides to obey and go into battle another thinks it is wrong to attack the enemy at this time and stays away from the battle and a third section decides to quit the trenches and retreat to another position instead of going forward.

Thus, discipline in the Communist Party is based upon the acceptance of the party program and in the blind faith of the membership in the central committee.

The Communist Party members cannot form any personal opinion whatsoever, they are taught that unified opinion is essential for unity in action, for successful work of the Communist Party. No party member is permitted to interpret a political issue individually and bring his individual opinion to the masses. The unified opinion which is hammered out in the party by discussion so that the party is able to lead in creating constant struggle.

The highest party body in the United States is the national convention. The national convention is the meeting of delegates elected at district conventions. The highest committee of the party is the central committee elected by the delegates at the national convention. The central committee leads the party organization with full authority between conventions and is responsible for its actions and decisions to the executive committee of the Communist International.

Let us sum up briefly the structure of the Communist Party in the order of responsibility on the basis of the foregoing description:

Unit bureau, unit membership meeting, section bureau, section committee, section convention, district bureau, district committee, district convention, political bureau of the C. C., central committee, national convention, political secretariat of the C. I., presidium of the C. I., executive committee of the C. I., world congress of the C. I.

Besides the basic organization of the party, the factory units, and the other forms of organization, street and town units, there is another instrument in the hands of the party through which we can influence the broadcast strata of organized workers; that is the fraction.

The fraction is an instrument in the hands of the party through which the policy of the party is brought to the organized masses, and through which the party gives leadership to members of the mass organizations. Fractions are built in all the trade unions and other mass organizations of the workers. In all unions and in cultural, fraternal, sport and employed organizations of the workers or farmers, in all united front organizations, in all conventions and conferences of such organizations where there are at least three Communists, a Communist fraction must be organized.

The party fraction in the shop committees, sport clubs, etc., are under the jurisdiction of the factory unit. The fractions in organizations in a unit territory are under the jurisdiction of the street or town unit. The fractions in organizations in a section territory are under the jurisdiction of the section committee; a fraction in an organization which covers a territory belonging to more than one section is under the jurisdiction of the district. The fractions in national organizations are under the jurisdiction of the central committee.

In all questions in which there is a decision of the corresponding party organization, the fractions must carry out these decisions. The policy for a mass organization is made in the party committee, but before the decisions are made on any basic question concerning the mass organization, the party committee invites the representatives of the given fraction to participate in the discussion. The fraction at this meeting has a consultative role. After the discussion, the decision is made by the party committee. The party committee can decide that the fraction members express their opinion on the problem through consultative voting. The decision, however, is made by the majority vote of the members of the party committee.

The leading fraction of a fraction in a given organization is composed of those party members who are elected by the members of this organization to the leading committees. For example: an organization with 300 members elects an executive committee of 15. Among these 15, there are 5 party members. These 5 party members compose the leading fraction in the organization.

The conditions for membership in the Communist Party are contained in the following pledge read by Earl Browder, secretary of the Communist Party, to 2,000 workers who were initiated into the Communist Party in the New York district in 1935.

"I now take my place in the ranks of the Communist Party, the party of the working class. I take solemn oath to give the best that is in me to the service of my class. I pledge myself to spare no effort in uniting the workers in militant struggle against fascism and war. I pledge myself to work unsparingly in the unions, in the shops, among the unemployed, to lead the struggle for the daily needs of the masses. I solemnly pledge to take my place in the forefront of the struggle for Negro rights; against Jim-Crowism, and lynching, against

the chauvinist lies of the ruling class. I pledge myself to rally the masses to defend the Soviet Union, the land of victorious socialism. I pledge myself to remain at all times vigilant and firm defender of the Leninist line of the party, the only line that insures the triumph of soviet power in the United States."

The Communist Party application carries this declaration:

"The undersigned declares his adherence to the program and status of the Communist International and the Communist Party and to engage actively in its work."

On the basis of this declaration the conditions for membership in the party may be enumerated in the following way:

1. Activity in the union.
2. Regular payment of membership dues.
3. Adherence to all decisions of the Comintern and of the party.
4. Adherence to the discipline of the party.

No Communist party member can transfer without special permission. If a member of the party moves from one place to another he must secure a transfer from the party organization before he moves. No party member has the right to leave his unit without permission. Units cannot accept any member without a transfer. A transfer card must be secured from the section committee in order to transfer from one unit to another in the same section; from one section to another section in the same section the transfer is issued by the district committee; from one district to another, the central committee issues the transfer; from the Communist Party of the U. S. A. to a Communist Party in another country the central committee issues the transfer.

We now introduce The Communist Party, A Manual on Organization, by J. Peters and request that it be marked "Exhibit 6."

In this manual we find this very interesting article on professional revolutionists.

"The party has full claim to the life of a Communist Party member: A professional revolutionist is a highly trained comrade, trained in revolutionary theory and practice, tested in struggles, who gives his whole life to the fight for the revolution and the interests of his own class. A professional revolutionist is ready to go whenever and wherever the party sends him. Today he may be working in a mine, organizing the party, the trade unions, leading struggles; tomorrow, if the party so decides, he may be in a steel mill; the day after tomorrow, he may be a leader and organizer of the unemployed. Naturally, these professional revolutionists are supported by the party organization if their assignment doesn't send them to work in shops or in mines. From these comrades the party demands everything. They accept party assignments—the matter of family associations and other personal problems are considered, but are not decisive. If the class struggle demands it, he will leave his family for months, even years. The professional revolutionist cannot be demoralized; he is steeled, stable. Nothing can shake him. Our task is to make every party member a professional revolutionist in this sense.

"The Communist Party with its revolutionary program, looks far beyond the perspective of the capitalist system and the complete liquidation of the exploitation of man through the private ownership of industry and the land, by establishment of socialism.

"Under the dictatorship all capitalist parties, Republican, Democratic, Progressive, etc., will be liquidated, the Communist Party functioning alone as the party of the toiling masses. Likewise, will be dissolved all other organizations that are political groups of the bourgeois rule, including chambers of commerce, employers associations, rotary clubs, American Legion, Y. M. C. A., and such fraternal orders as the Masons, Odd Fellows, Elks, Knights of Columbus, etc."

In the Program of the Communists, by N. Bucharin, which we now introduce and request to be marked "Exhibit 7," we find this very interesting statement:

"Only by means of a civil war and the iron dictatorship of the proletariat can we achieve a cooperative communistic production. Destruction of the bourgeois state, workers dictatorship, expropriation of the capitalist class of the production by the working class, a free road to communism, that is the program of the Communist Party."

From Exhibit 3 (Theses, Statutes, and Conditions of Admission to the Third International) we quote the following:

"Only a violent defeat of the bourgeoisie, confiscation of its property, annihilation of the entire bourgeois government apparatus, parliamentary,

judiciary, military, bureaucratic, administrative, municipal, etc., even the individual exile or internment of the most stubborn and dangerous exploiters, the establishment of a strict control over them for the repression of all inevitable attempts at resistance and restoration of capitalistic slavery—only such measures will be able to guarantee the complete submission of the whole class of exploiters.”

In the above, we see to what extremes a victorious Communist Party would go, to preserve its position of mastery over a defeated democratic America.

A few excerpts from exhibit 8 (the acceptance speeches of William Z. Foster and James Ford, Communist candidates for President and Vice President, respectively) follow:

“It is important to build up a strong Communist vote in order to organize and measure the sentiment of the masses and elect representatives to the capitalistic government, not in the illusion that workers can ‘peacefully’ capture the Government, but to enable them to better expose the capitalistic government, to wring concessions from the employers, and to bring the communistic program forcefully before the masses.”

“Capitalism must be overthrown, the industries and lands socialized, exploitation abolished, and socialism established. The Communist Party fights to establish a workers’ and farmers’ government, it struggles ever and always for a United Soviet States of America.”

“Capitalism will not die. It must be killed—and the workers of the world are getting ready to kill it.”

“It is the aim of the Communist Party to expropriate the expropriators, that is to confiscate without remuneration the great industries and the big land holdings from the parasitic class, who now own them. The revolutionary workers’ and farmers’ government will never pay the capitalists for the great industrial and natural resources of the country.”

II. ALLEGIANCE

Members of the Communist Party, regardless whether they were born in the United States and are legally citizens of the United States or are foreign born, acknowledge no allegiance to the Government of the United States or to the Stars and Stripes although they enjoy all the privileges and liberties granted by our Government.

They loudly proclaim, instead, their allegiance to the Communist International and to the “red” flag, the Communist emblem.

They proclaim the Soviet Republic as the fatherland of the workers and therefore their fatherland. They teach their children to pledge allegiance as follows:

“I pledge allegiance to the workers “red” flag and the cause for which it stands; one aim throughout our lives, freedom for the working class.”

In order to clarify the Communists’ attitude toward the abolition of patriotism to America and the arousing of patriotism to the Soviet Republic, we offer the following quotations from the statement of Alex Bittleman, an outstanding Communist, and request that it be marked “Exhibit 9”:

“Defense of ‘country and fatherland’ as long as the capitalist class is in power, means to sacrifice the working class to the interests of the capitalist class. It means to help perpetuate misery, slavery, and exploitation. It means to assist the capitalists and imperialists to save capitalism.

“Only with the overthrow of capitalist class rule and the establishment of working class rule do the toiling masses acquire a country and a fatherland. Only then, does it become the duty of the workers and the exploited farmers to defend and protect their land from capitalist and imperialist attacks.

“The toiling masses of the United States today have no country and no fatherland.”

We now introduce the following quotation taken from the acceptance speech of William Z. Foster, when he ran for the office of President of the United States, heretofore introduced as exhibit 8.

“Our party, different from the Socialist Party, creates no illusions amongst the workers that they can vote their way to emancipation, that they can capture the ready-made machinery of the State and utilize it for the emancipation of the working class. On the contrary, we must utilize this campaign to carry on a widespread and energetic propaganda to teach the workers that the capitalist class would never allow the working class peacefully to take control of the state. That is their strong right arm and they will fight violently to the end

to retain it. The working class must shatter the capitalist state. It must build a new state, a new government, a workers' and farmers' government, the Soviet government of the United States."

We now introduce the document "Program of the Communist International," and ask that it be marked "Exhibit 10."

In the Program of the Communist International, the Communists give us their description of the important position the Soviet Union holds in the world today:

"* * * The Soviet Republic (U. S. S. R.), is an extremely important factor in the general crisis of capitalism not only because she has dropped out of the world capitalist system and created a basis for a new social system of production, but also because she plays an exceptionally great revolutionary role generally; she is the international driving force of proletarian revolution that impels the proletariat of all countries to seize power."

On the question of the state, the Communists say, in *Why Communism*, heretofore introduced as exhibit 4:

"The truth of the matter is that this is a rich man's state and a rich man's government. The state is there to act on behalf of finance capital and to protect its interests against the people. The government is the executive committee of the big trusts.

"You, an American worker, may be shocked to hear such statements. You have been fed so much 'democracy' bunk that you think it almost sacrilege to reveal the true nature of the state. This is exactly what your masters are after with their propaganda. They want you to believe that the state is holy and that its high functionaries are like saints, surrounded by halos. All the pulpits, schools, newspapers, radio, lectures, moving pictures, and other sources of information controlled by big business are engaged in giving you false notions about the state.

"The state is an instrument of power in the hands of the big industrialists, bankers, and landlords, who by this token are the ruling class. The state is there to effect the exploitation and oppression of the workers and the poor and small farmers, and also of the subjugated colonial people, by the ruling class. The Constitution, the Government, its laws, its agencies, the Army, the militia, the police, the courts, the jails, the legislature—all are there to effect the exploitation and oppression of you and millions like you."

We now introduce as one document the *Fighting Worker*, November 30, 1935; *New Militant*, January 4, 1936; and *Daily Worker* of January 14, 1936; and request that it be marked "Exhibit 11":

"Revolutionary workers everywhere! Capitalism can be overthrown. Two great strike waves have shaken the American imperialist giant. The struggles of our class brothers in Latin America are undermining its base. Great battles loom! There is no time to lose! To defend the Soviet Union, to extend the October revolution, to overthrow capitalism we must build a revolutionary party!" (*Fighting Worker*, November 30, 1935.)

"As has already been indicated, the defense of the Soviet Union is one of the primary tasks of the working class in the coming war. But, to a Marxist, what does defense of the Soviet Union mean? The essence can be summed up quickly. It means: 'Extend the October revolution.' * * *

"* * * It means to put all faith in the working class. It means to achieve victory in the capitalist nations. And it means these things quite openly and realistically. For these are the only possible defense of the Soviet Union." (*New Militant*, January 4, 1936.)

"* * * if the imperialists unite in their murder march against the Soviet Union, we must be prepared to wage relentless struggle using every weapon at our command for the defense of the Soviet Union! (*Daily Worker*, January 14, 1936.)

III. THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

In the first section of this brief entitled "The Communist Party, U. S. A. Section Communist International," we have shown that the Communist Party is not a political entity with allegiance only to the United States of America, but that it is inextricably bound to and takes orders from a world-wide organization known as the Communist International. If the Communist Party existed only within the bounds of the United States of America, we could easily ascertain its aims and objects. That is not the case. Taking orders as it does from the Communist International, we are forced to look to the Communist Interna-

tional for the ultimate aims and objects of the Communist Party of the United States.

Our first scrutiny should be devoted to the structure of this organization. At this time we desire to introduce the leaflet entitled "The Foundation of the Communist International" by V. I. Lenin. This leaflet was purchased in an official Communist Bookstore located at 226½ South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif., and was admitted by the clerk to be an accepted document of the Communist Party of the United States of America. We request that it be accepted and marked as "Exhibit 12." We quote therefrom as follows:

Page 3: "In March of this year, 1919, there took place an international congress of Communists in Moscow. This Congress founded the Third Communist International, the union of the workers of the world striving to establish Soviet power in all countries. The First International, founded by Marx, existed from 1864 to 1872. The Second International existed from 1889 to 1914, until the war."

"Throughout the world the Union of Communists is growing. In a number of countries soviet power has already been victorious. It will not be long before we see the victory of communism throughout the world, the foundation of the World Federal Republic of Soviets."

Page 25: "The foundation of the Third Communist International is the forerunner of the International Republic of Soviets, of the international victory of communism." Published in Pravda, March 6, 1919.

Page 47: "Today, when the word 'Soviet' has become understood by all, the victory of the Communist revolution is certain. The comrades who are present in this hall saw how the first soviet republic was formed. They now see how the Third Communist International has been formed. They will all see how the World Federal Republic of Soviets will be formed."

The introduction of this evidence is made in order to show that the present world-wide organization called The Communist International is based upon the Third International Congress of Communists held in Moscow in the year 1919.

This congress adopted a certain constitution and rules for the government of the organization throughout the world. We refer again to "The Program of the Communist International," exhibit 10. We desire to call particular attention to the constitution and rules as published in an appendix to the Program and from which we quote as follows:

"1. The Communist International—the International Workers' Association—is a union of communist parties in various countries; it is a world communist party. As the leader and organizer of the world revolutionary movement of the proletariat and the upholder of the principles and aims of communism, the Communist International strives to win over the majority of the working class and the broad strata of the propertyless peasantry, fights for the establishment of the world dictatorship of the proletariat, for the establishment of the World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, for the complete abolition of classes and for the achievement of socialism—the first stage of Communist society.

"2. Each of the various parties affiliated to the Communist International is called the Communist Party of * * * (name of country) (section of the Communist International). In any given country there can be only one Communist Party affiliated to the Communist International and representing its section in that country.

"3. Membership in the Communist Party and in the Communist International is open to all those who accept the program and rules of the given Communist Party and of the Communist International, who join one of the basic units of a party, actively work in it, abide by all the decisions of the party and of the Communist International, and regularly pay party dues.

"4. The Communist International and its sections are built up on the basis of democratic centralism * * * (c) decisions of superior party committees to be obligatory for subordinate committees, strictly party discipline and prompt execution of the decisions of the Communist International, of its leading committees and of the leading party centres.

"5. Party questions may be discussed by members of the party and by party organizations until such time as a decision is taken upon them by the competent party committees. After a decision has been taken by the Congress of the Communist International, by the Congress of the respective sections, or by leading committees of the Comintern, and of its various sections, these decisions must be unreservedly carried out even if a section of the party mem-

bership or of the local party organizations are in disagreement with it. * * *

"6. In all nonparty workers' and peasants' mass organizations and in their leading committees (trade unions, cooperative societies, sport organizations, ex-service mens' organizations, and at their congresses and conferences) and also on municipal bodies and in parliament, even if there are only two party members in such organizations and bodies, Communist fractions must be formed for the purpose of strengthening the party's influence and for carrying out its policy in these organizations and bodies.

"13. The decisions of the E. C. C. I. (E. C. C. I. is abbreviation for Executive Committee International) are obligatory for all the sections of the Communist International and must be promptly carried out. * * *

"14. The central committees of the various sections of the Communist International are responsible to their respective party congresses and of central committees of parties and also to make decisions which are obligatory for them.

"15. The E. C. C. I. has the right to expel from the Communist International, entire sections, groups, and individual members who violate the program and rules of the Communist International or the decisions of the world congress and of the E. C. C. I.

"16. The programs of the various sections of the Communist International must be endorsed by the E. C. C. I. * * *

"17. The leading organs of the press of the various sections of the Communist International must publish all the decisions and official documents of the E. C. C. I. These decisions must, as far as possible, be published also in the other organs of the party press. (This policy is carried out by the Communist Party in the U. S. A. by their official organ, The Daily Worker.)

"19. The E. C. C. I. elects a presidium responsible to the E. C. C. I., which acts as the permanent body carrying out all the business of the E. C. C. I. in the interval between the meetings of the latter. * * *

"21. The sections must carry out the instructions of the permanent bureaus of the E. C. C. I. * * *

"22. The E. C. C. I. and its presidium have the right to send their representatives to the various sections of the Communist International. Such representatives receive their instructions from the E. C. C. I. or from its presidium, and are responsible to them for their activities. Representatives of the E. C. C. I. must carry out their commission in close contact with the central committee of the section to which they are sent. They may, however, speak in opposition to the central committee of the given section, at congresses and conferences of that section, if the line of the central committee in question diverges from the instructions of the E. C. C. I. * * *

"The E. C. C. I. and its presidium also have the right to send instructors to the various sections of the Communist International. * * *

"24. Meetings of the presidium (according to the Daily Worker, members of the presidium of the Communist International include J. Stalin, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; Bela Kun, Hungary; Fritz Hecker, Germany) of the E. C. C. I. must take place not less than once a fortnight. * * *

"25. The presidium elects the political secretariat, which is empowered to take decisions and which also prepares questions for the meetings of the E. C. C. I. and of its presidium, and acts as their executive body.

"28. The International Control Commission investigates matters concerning the unity of the sections affiliated to the Communist International and also matters connected with the Communist conduct of individual members of the various sections. * * * Audits the accounts of the Communist International. * * *

"30. Resignation from office by individual members or groups of members of central committees of the various sections are regarded as disruptive of the Communist movement. Leading posts in the party do not belong to the occupant of that post, but to the Communist International as a whole. Elected members of the central leading bodies of the various sections may resign before their time of office expires, only with the consent of the E. C. C. I. Resignations accepted by the central committees of sections without the consent of the E. C. C. I. are invalid.

"31. The sections affiliated to the Communist International must maintain close organizational and informational contact with each other, arrange for mutual representation at each other's conferences and congresses, and with the consent of the E. C. C. I., exchange leading comrades. * * *

"35. The International League of Communist Youth (Communist Youth International) is a section of the Communist International with full rights and is subordinate to the E. C. C. I.

"36. The communist parties must be prepared for transition to illegal conditions. The E. C. C. I. must render the parties concerned assistance in their preparations for transition to illegal conditions.

"37. Individual members of sections of the Communist International may pass from one country to another only with the consent of the central committee of the section of which they are members.

"Communists changing their domicile must join the section in the country of their new domicile. Communists leaving their country without the consent of the central committee of their section, must not be accepted into other sections of the Communist International."

We call particular attention to paragraph 1 in which it is stated that it is a World Communist Party, and the leader and organizer is a world revolutionary movement of the proletariat.

In paragraph 2 it is stated that the Communist Party of the U. S. A. is a section of the Communist International. In paragraph 3 we are shown that the Communist Party of the U. S. A. must abide by all the decisions of the Communist International.

During the interim between meetings of the world congress the executive committee of the Communist International operates in its place and stead and is seated within the United Socialist Soviet Republic's capitol in Moscow.

In paragraph 13 we are told that the decisions of this executive committee are obligatory for all the sections of the Communist International. Placed above the E. C. C. I. is what is known as the presidium. This presidium is the real functioning body between meetings of the E. C. C. I. Thus we see that while the democratic form of operation and direction is claimed, the actual and final authority rests in the decisions made by a compact group located within the boundaries of the only existing Socialist state, namely, the U. S. S. R.

At the time of the formation of the Third International, certain conditions of admission were laid down. These conditions of admission set forth the terms upon which the Communist Party in any country of the world could become affiliated with C. I.

At this time we desire to introduce a pamphlet entitled "The 21 Conditions of Admission to the Communist International." by O. Piatnitsky. This pamphlet was purchased in an official Communist bookstore located at 226½ South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif., and was admitted by the clerk to be an official document of the Communist Party of the U. S. A. We request that it be accepted and marked as "Exhibit 13." We quote the following from it:

"1. The periodical and nonperiodical press and all party publishing organizations must be wholly subordinate to the central committee of the party, irrespective as to whether the party as a whole, at the given moment, is legal or illegal. That publishing organizations, abusing their autonomy, should pursue a policy that does not completely correspond to the policy of the party, cannot be tolerated.

"In the columns of the newspapers, at public meetings, in the trade-unions, in the cooperative societies—wherever the adherents of the Third International gain access—they must systematically and mercilessly denounce not only the bourgeoisie, but also its assistants, the reformists of every shade.

"2. Every organization desiring to belong to the Communist International must steadily and systematically remove from all responsible posts in the labor movement in the party organization, editorial boards, trade-unions, parliamentary fractions, cooperative societies, municipalities, etc., all reformists and followers of the center, and have them replaced by Communists, even at the cost of replacing at the beginning 'experienced' leaders by rank-and-file working-men.

"4. The obligation to spread Communist ideas includes the particular necessity of persistent, systematic propaganda in the army. Whenever such propaganda is forbidden by exceptional laws, it must be carried on illegally. The abandonment of such work would be equivalent to the betrayal of revolutionary duty, and is incompatible with membership in the Third International.

"5. It is necessary to carry on systematic and steady agitation in the rural districts. The working class cannot consolidate its victory without the backing of at least part of the agricultural laborers and the poorest peasants, and without having neutralized, by its policy a part of the rest of the rural population.

Communist work in the rural districts is acquiring a predominant importance during the present period. It should be carried on, in the main, by revolutionary Communist workers of both city and country only, who have connections with the rural districts. To refuse to do this work or to transfer such work to untrustworthy half-reformists is equal to renouncing the proletarian revolution.

"6. Every party that desires to belong to the Third International must expose not only open social patriotism but also the falsity and hypocrisy of social-pacifism; it must systematically demonstrate to the workers that without the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, no international arbitration counts, no disarmament, no 'democratic' reorganization of the League of Nations will save mankind from new imperialist wars.

"7. The parties desiring to belong to the Communist International must recognize the necessity of a complete and absolute rupture with reformism and the policy of the center, and they must carry on propaganda in favor of this rupture among the broadest circles of the party membership. Otherwise a consistent Communist policy is impossible.

"The Communist International unconditionally and peremptorily demands that this split be brought about with the least delay. The Communist International cannot reconcile itself to the fact that such avowed reformists, as Turatti, Kautsky, Hilferding, Hillquit, Longuet, MacDonald, Modigliani, and others should be entitled to consider themselves members of the Third International. This would make the Third International resemble, to a considerable degree, the late Second International.

"8. On the question of the colonies and oppressed nationalities, an especially distinct and clear line must be taken by the parties in those countries where the bourgeoisie possesses colonies or oppresses other nations. Every party desirous of belonging to the Third International must ruthlessly denounce the methods of 'their own' imperialists in the colonies, supporting, not in words, but in deeds every independence movement in the colonies. It should demand the expulsion of their own imperialists from such colonies, and cultivate among the workers of their own country a truly fraternal attitude toward the toiling population of the colonies and oppressed nationalities, and carry on systematic agitation in its own army against every kind of oppression of the colonial population.

"9. Every party that desires to belong to the Communist International must carry on systematic and persistent Communist work in the trade-unions, in workers' and industrial councils, in the cooperative societies, and in other mass organization. Within these organizations, it is necessary to create Communist groups, which by means of practical and stubborn work must win over the trade-union, etc., for the cause of communism. These cells should constantly denounce the treachery of the social patriots and the vacillations of the center at every step. These Communist groups should be completely subordinate to the party as a whole.

"10. Every party that belongs to the Communist International must carry on a stubborn struggle against the Amsterdam 'International' of 'yellow' trade-unions. It must give all the support in its power to the incipient international alliance of the 'red' trade-unions affiliated to the Communist International.

"11. The parties desiring to belong to the Third International must overhaul the membership of their parliamentary fractions, eliminate all unreliable elements from them, to control these fractions, not only verbally but in reality, to subordinate them to the central committee of the party, and demand from every Communist member of parliament that he devote his entire activities to the interests of really revolutionary propaganda agitation.

"12. Parties belonging to the Communist International must be built up on the principle of democratic centralism. At the present time of acute civil war, the Communist Party will only be able fully to do its duty when it is organized in the most centralized manner, if it has iron discipline, bordering on military discipline, and if the party center is a powerful, authoritative organ with wide powers, possessing the general trust of the party membership.

"14. Every party that desires to belong to the Communist International must give every possible support to the Soviet Republics in their struggle against all counterrevolutionary forces. The Communist parties should carry on a precise and definite propaganda to induce the workers to refuse to transport munitions of war intended for enemies of the Soviet Republics, carry on legal or illegal propaganda among the troops which are sent to crush the workers' republics, etc.

"15. The parties which up to the present have retained their old social-democratic programs must in the shortest possible time overhaul these programs and draw up a new Communist program in conformity with the special conditions of their respective countries and in accordance with resolutions of the Communist International. As a rule, the program of every party that belongs to the Communist International must be ratified by the next congress of the Communist International or by the executive committee. In the event of the executive committee of the Communist International failing to ratify the program of a particular party, that party has the right to appeal to the congress of the Communist International.

"16. All decisions of the congresses of the Communist International, as well as the decisions of its executive committee, are binding on all parties affiliated to the Communist International. The Communist International, operating in the midst of most acute civil war, must have a far more centralized form of organization than that of the Second International. At the same time, the Communist International and its executive committee must, of course, in all their activities, take into consideration the diversity of the conditions under which the various parties have to work and fight, and should issue universally binding decisions only on questions on which the passing of such decisions is possible.

"18. All the leading party organs of the press in all countries must publish all the chief documents of the executive committee of the Communist International.

"20. The parties that would now like to join the Third International but which have not yet radically changed their former tactics must, before joining, take steps to ensure that their central committees and all most important central bodies of the respective parties shall be composed, to the extent of at least two-thirds, of such comrades as even prior to the Second Congress of the Communist International have openly and definitely declared for joining the Third International. Exceptions may be made with approval of the executive committee of the Third International.

"21. Members of the party who reject the conditions of these of the Communist International, on principle, must be expelled from the party.

"This applies also to the delegates to the special party congresses."

Having now proven the character of organization of the Communist International and conditions of admission thereto, we now desire to again point out that the Communist Party of the U. S. A. section Communist International is merely a section of the world-wide organization and has accepted all the conditions of admission, as laid down in the document just introduced.

We can now proceed to a study of the progress of the Communist International to accomplish its object through the world.

Nothing can be more enlightening than the document which we have heretofore introduced and marked "Exhibit 10, namely, the Program of the Communist International, from which we now quote:

"The epoch of imperialism is the epoch of moribund capitalism. The World War of 1914-18 and the general crisis of capitalism which it unleashed, being the direct result of the sharp contradiction between the growth of the productive forces of the world economy and the national state barriers, have shown and proved that the material prerequisites for socialism have already ripened in the womb of capitalist society, that the shell of capitalism has become an intolerable hindrance to the further development of mankind, and that history has brought to the forefront the task of the revolutionary overthrow of the yoke of capitalism.

"Imperialism subjects large masses of the proletariat of all countries—from the centers of capitalist might to the most remote corners of the colonial world—to the dictatorship of the finance-capitalist plutocracy. With elemental force, imperialism exposes and accentuates all the contradictions of capitalist society; it carries class oppression to the utmost limits, intensifies to an extraordinary degree the struggle between capitalist states, inevitably gives rise to world-wide imperialist wars that shake the whole prevailing system of relationships to the foundations, and inexorably leads to the world proletarian revolution.

"Binding the whole world in chains of finance-capital, forcing its yoke, by bloodletting, by mailed fist and starvation, upon the proletariat of all countries, of all nations and races, sharpening to an immeasurable degree the exploitation, oppression, and enslavement of the proletariat and confronting it with the immediate task of conquering power-imperialism, creates the necessity for closely uniting the workers of all countries, irrespective of state boundaries and of differ-

ences of nationality, culture, language, race, sex, or occupation, in a single international army of the proletariat. Thus while imperialism develops and completes the process of creating the material prerequisites for socialism, it at the same time musters the army of its own gravediggers, compelling the proletariat to organize into a *militant international workers association.*

On the other hand, imperialism splits off the best-provided-for section of the working class from the main mass of the workers. Bribed and corrupted by imperialism, this upper stratum of the working class, which constitutes the leading element in the Socialist-democratic parties, which has a stake in the imperialist plunder of the colonies and is loyal to "its own" bourgeoisie and "its own" imperialist state, has lined up in the decisive class battles with the class enemy of the proletariat. The split that occurred in the Socialist movement in 1914 as a result of this treachery, and the subsequent treachery of the social-democratic parties, the international proletariat will be able to fulfill its historical mission—to throw off the yoke of imperialism and establish the proletarian dictatorship—only by ruthless struggle against social democracy. Hence, the organization of the forces of the international revolution becomes possible only on the platform of communism. In opposition to the opportunity Second International of the social democracy, which has become the agency of the imperialism in the ranks of the working class, inevitably rises the Third Communist International, the international organization of the working class, which embodies the real unity of the revolutionary workers of the world.

The war of 1914-18 gave rise to the first attempts to establish a new revolutionary international, as a counterpoise to the Second (social-chauvinist) International, and as a weapon of resisting to bellicose imperialism (Zimmerwald and Kienthal). The victorious proletarian revolution in Russia gave impetus to the formation of Communist parties in the centers of capitalism and in the colonies. In 1919 the Communist International was formed, and for the first time in world history the most advanced strata of the European and American proletariat were really united in the process of practical revolutionary struggle with the proletariat of China and India with the Negro toilers of Africa and America.

As the united and centralized International Party of the proletariat, the Communist International is the only heir to the principles of the First International, carrying them forward upon the new, mass foundation of the revolutionary proletarian movement. The experience gathered from the first imperialist war, from the subsequent periods of the revolutionary crisis of capitalism, from the series of revolutions in Europe and in the colonial countries; the experience gathered from the dictatorships of the proletariat and the socialist construction of the U. S. S. R. and from the work of all the sections of the Communist International as recorded in the decisions of its congresses; finally, the fact that the struggle between the imperialist bourgeoisie and the proletariat is more and more assuming an international character—all this creates the need for a program of the Communist International, a uniform and common program for all Sections of the Communist International. This program of the Communist International, as the supreme critical generalization of the whole body of historical experience of the international revolutionary proletarian movement, becomes the program of struggle for the world proletarian dictatorship, the program of struggle for world communism.

Uniting as it does the revolutionary workers, who lead the millions of oppressed and exploited against the bourgeoisie and its socialist agents, the Communist International regards itself as the historical successor to the Communist League and the First International led by Marx, and as the inheritor of the best of the pre-war traditions of the Second International proletarian struggle for socialism. The Second International in the best period of its existence, prepared the ground for the expansion of the labor movement among the masses. The Third Communist International in continuing the work of the Second International has resolutely lopped off the latter's opportunism, social-chauvinism, and bourgeois distortion of socialism and has commenced to realize the dictatorship of the proletariat. In this manner the Communist International continues the glorious and heroic traditions of the international labor movement; of the English chartists and the French insurrectionists of 1831; of the French and German working-class revolutionaries of 1848; of the immortal fighters and martyrs of the Paris Commune; of the valiant soldiers of the German, Hungarian, and Finnish revolutions; of the workers under former tsarist despotism—the victorious bearers of the proletarian dictatorship of the Chinese proletarians—the heroes of Canton and Shanghai.

"Basing itself on the experience of the revolutionary labor movement on all continents and of all peoples, the Communist International, in its theoretical and practical work, stands wholly and unreservedly upon the ground of revolutionary Marxism and its further development, Leninism, which is nothing else but Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution.

"Advocating and propagating the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels and employing it as the revolutionary method of the cognition of reality, with the view to the revolutionary transformation of this reality, the Communist International wages an active struggle against all forms of theoretical and practical opportunism and all forms of bourgeois philosophy. Standing on the ground of consistent proletarian class struggle and subordinating the temporary, partial, group, and national interests of the proletariat to its lasting, general, international interests, the Communist International mercilessly exposes all forms of the doctrine of "class peace" that the reformists have accepted from the bourgeoisie. Expressing the historical need for an international organization of revolutionary proletarians—the grave diggers of the capitalist order—the Communist International is the only international force that has for its program the dictatorship of the proletariat and that openly comes out as the organizer of the international proletarian revolution.

"When a revolutionary situation is developing, the party advances certain transitional slogans and partial demands correspondingly to the concrete situation; but these demands and slogans must be bent to the revolutionary aim of capturing power and of overthrowing bourgeois capitalist society. The party must neither stand aloof from the daily needs and struggle of the working class nor confine its activities exclusively to them. The task of the party is to utilize these minor every-day needs as a starting point from which to lead the working class to the revolutionary struggle for power.

"In the event of a revolutionary upsurge, if the ruling classes are disorganized, the masses are in a state of revolutionary ferment and the intermediary strata are inclining toward the proletariat; if the masses are ready for action and for sacrifice, the party of the proletariat is confronted with the task of leading the masses to a direct attack upon the bourgeois state. This it does by carrying on propaganda in favor of increasingly radical transitional slogans (for Soviets, workers' control of industry, for peasant committees for the seizure of the big landed property, for the disarming the bourgeoisie and arming the proletariat, etc.) and by organizing mass action, upon which all branches of the party agitation and propaganda, including parliamentary activity, must be concentrated. This mass action includes: A combination of strikes and demonstrations; a combination of strikes and armed demonstrations and, finally, the general strike jointly with armed insurrections against the state power of the bourgeoisie. The latter form of struggle, which is supreme in its form, must be conducted according to the rules of military science; it presupposes a plan of campaign, offensive fighting operations and unbounded devotion and heroism on the part of the proletariat. An absolutely essential prerequisite for this form of action is the organization of the broad masses into militant units, which by their very form, embrace and set into action the largest possible numbers of toilers (Councils of Workers' Deputies, Soldiers' Councils, etc.), and intensified revolutionary work in the army and navy.

"There can be working class movements without the Communist Party, but there can be no real movement for the liberation of the working class without the Communist Party. There can be no ultimate overthrow of the entire capitalist system without the Communist Party.

"There is a Communist Party in every country of the world. All of them work for the same end, and all of them adapt their activities to conditions existing in their country. Delegates from each Communist Party gather once in a few years to an international Communist congress (there have been six of them so far). The congress meets for the 2 or 3 weeks and discusses thoroughly the international situation and the situation in every country. Experience of a world-wide struggle are shared and a general line of further struggles mapped out. The congress elects an executive committee which is the leading body between one congress and another. The decisions of the executive committee of the Communist International guide the activities of the parties. The executive committee meets at intervals of a few months. Its meetings resemble a small congress. Between one meeting and the other a smaller body called presidium is conducting the affairs of the organization. The organization is called the Communist International and expresses the common purpose and common de-

cisions of all the Communist parties of the world. The Communist International (Comintern) gives unity of policy and leadership to the entire revolutionary movement of the world. It is the general staff of the world revolution of all the exploited and oppressed.

"The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is affiliated with the Communist International. Its advice is highly precious because it has long accomplished what the Communist parties of the world are only striving at—the proletarian revolution. The advice and experiences of the other parties, however, are also of great value in determining the policies of the Comintern. The seat of the Comintern is Moscow because this is the capital of the only workers' and peasants' governmental body in the world, and the Comintern can meet there freely. As the workers become the rulers of other countries the Comintern will not have to confine its meetings to Moscow alone.

"The Communist Party of the U. S. A. is thus a part of a world-wide organization which gives it guidance and enhances its fighting power. Under the leadership of the Communist Party the workers of the U. S. A. will proceed from struggle to struggle, from victory to victory, until, rising in a revolution, they will crush the capitalist state, establish a soviet state, abolish cruel and bloody system of capitalism and proceed to the upbuilding of socialism.

"This is why every worker must join the Communist Party."

IV. THE ULTIMATE AIM

The preface to the Communist pamphlet, *The Ultimate Aim*, which we now introduce and request to be marked "Exhibit 14," states:

"We are fighting for communism.

"The enemies and opponents of communism have always argued that communism is mere empty Utopia, an unrealizable thing, a fantasy, a dream, which will never be brought to life.

"But the experience of the Soviet Union has brilliantly shown that the dreamers are those who imagined that capitalism will live for ever. Socialism, that is to say, the first stage of communism, is becoming a reality; socialism is coming powerfully to life; socialism is impetuously reconstructing life. But capitalism can only dream about the return of its one-time strength.

"Socialists declare that they know a better road to socialism than that along which the Communists are leading the working class. Their road is better, they say, because it is a peaceful one, without revolutions and convulsions.

"We shall discover below whether it is possible to get socialism without a proletarian revolution and the proletarian dictatorship, whom these opinions of the Socialists about a peaceful transition to socialism really serve, and whom they hope to deceive by them; and in what way the victory of communism is attained."

And in conclusion the pamphlet states these facts:

"Our ultimate aim is the construction of socialist society, that is, of such a system in which there will be no private property in the means of production, there will be no exploiters or exploited, or classes of any kind; in which there will be no state; in which production and consumption will be arranged according to principle, 'from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs,' in which technique, science, and art will attain unheard-of heights, and human labor will become the everyday creative need of man.

"Socialism is the lower stage of communism, when the level of productive forces allows the needs of the population to be satisfied only in accordance with the amount of labor spent by the worker. There are no classes under socialism, but the apparatus of the state is still preserved and carries on a struggle for the overcoming of the relics and survival of class society. The U. S. S. R. has entered the period of socialism and is building classless socialist society.

"The transition to socialism is only possible as a consequence of the proletarian revolution, the conquest of state power by the working class and the establishment of proletarian dictatorship. There is no other way for creating a socialist society.

"The U. S. S. R. is the country of the proletarian dictatorship. The Soviet system is the organization of the rule of the working class, in alliance with the laboring peasantry, under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party which fights for the building of classless society."

The following quotations are taken from previously mentioned exhibit 4 (the Communist publication *Why Communism?* by N. J. Olgin).

"The overthrow of the state power, and, with it, of the capitalist system, grows out of the everyday struggles of the workers. One is historically inseparable from the other.

"The clearer the class consciousness of the workers, the more steered they are in fighting, the better the revolutionary leadership they have developed in the course of years, the greater the number of friends they have allied with themselves from among the other oppressed classes, the more capable are they to deal the final blow.

"It is not necessary that this final blow, i. e., the revolution, should come in connection with an imperialist war, although this is most likely. Capitalism will seek to prevent a revolution by plunging the country into war."

We now introduce the following excerpts taken from a handbook for young Communists. The Young Communist League, from Young Communists In Action, compiled by Lewis Miller, and request that this be marked "Exhibit 15":

"We Communists openly proclaim our aims. We tell the workers that under the leadership of the Communist Party and the Young Communist League capitalism will be overthrown and a government controlled by the workers and farmers put in its place.

"As a member of the Young Communist League it is your duty to study the Communist program. You must be able to explain to the satisfaction of any worker what are our aims and what we are doing in order to achieve these aims. Furthermore, in order to take your place in the revolutionary movement you must study our methods of work and put them into practice in everyday Communist activity.

"Just as the Russian workers, with the leadership of the Russian Communist Party, were able to free themselves from the yoke of czarism and capitalism, so will we in the United States, under the leadership of the Communist Party and the Young Communist League, overthrow capitalism and build a workers' and farmers' government—a Soviet America!"

"If it is necessary to destroy the capitalist government, why do we take part in elections?" you ask.

"The Communist Party and the Y. C. L. have a definite purpose in taking part in elections. To begin with, they afford us an opportunity to publicize our platform and the demands of the working class.

"Secondly, Communist candidates who are elected use their office in order to better carry on the fight to improve the conditions of the workers, and in order to expose the capitalist governments and show the necessity for setting up a workers' government. Lastly, the vote can be taken as a partial indication of the strength and support of the Communist Party, even though we know that many thousands of workers—Negroes, foreign-born 'paupers,' soldiers and sailors—are denied votes or cheated out of them. Young Communist League candidates in elections have the particular purpose of advancing demands for improvement in the conditions of the youth."

Excerpts taken from exhibit 10 (program of the Communist International) are as follows:

"The victorious proletariat utilizes the conquest of power as a lever of economic revolution, i. e., a revolutionary transformation of the property relations of capitalism into relationships of the socialist mode of production.

"The confiscation and proletarian nationalization of all large capitalist undertakings (factories, works, mines, and electric power stations) and the transference of all State and municipal enterprises to the soviets.

"The confiscation and proletarian nationalization of all large landed estates in town and country (private, church, monastery, and other lands) and the transference of State and municipal landed property (including forests, minerals, lakes, rivers, etc.) to the soviets with subsequent nationalization of the whole of the land.

"The confiscation of big house property.

"The transfer of confiscated houses to the administration of the local soviets.

"The monopoly of newspaper and book publishing.

"The nationalization of big cinema enterprises, theaters, etc."

Why Communism? previously marked "Exhibit 4," interprets the Communists' position on many things as follows:

"* * * It is the task of the soviets to abolish private property in the means of production and to establish socialistic production and distribution: This cannot be accomplished peacefully. This means the Soviet state must be ruthless. It must destroy the counter-revolutionary forces, the quicker the

better for the workers and for the future of mankind. This is why the Soviet state is named the dictatorship of the proletariat. * * * It openly declares itself to be a class government, directed against the former ruling class. It uses force and violence against that class.

"There is no way out except by the creation of a revolutionary democracy of the toilers, which is at the same time a stern dictatorship against the capitalists and their agents. There is no way out except by seizing from the capitalists the industries, the banks, and all the economic institutions and transferring them into the common property of all under the direction of the revolutionary movement. There is no way out, in short, except by the abolition of the capitalist system and the establishment of a socialistic society.

"The Communist Party is unswervingly convinced that the way out of the present industrial and agrarian crisis which will bring real liberty to the workers and toiling farmers is the revolutionary way out, that is, the proletarian revolution carried out under the leadership of the proletariat is an alliance of the workers and the toiling farmers."

Excerpts from the Report No. 153 submitted to the Congress of the United States, February 15, 1935, is hereby introduced and a request is made that it be marked "Exhibit 16."

"The nature and extent of organized Communist activity in the United States has been established by testimony and the objectives of such activities clearly defined. Both from documentary evidence submitted to the committee and from the frank admission of Communist leaders (cf. Browder and Ford, New York hearing, July 12, 1934) these objectives include:

"1. The overthrow by force and violence of the republican form of government guaranteed by article IV, section 4, of the Federal Constitution.

"2. The substitution of a soviet form of government based on class domination to be achieved by abolition of elected representatives both to the legislative and executive branches, as provided by article I, by the several sections of article II of the same Constitution and by the fourteenth amendment.

"3. The confiscation of private property by governmental decree, without the due process of law and compensation guaranteed by the fifth amendment.

"4. Restriction of the rights of religious freedom, of speech, and of the press as guaranteed by the first amendment.

"These specific purposes by Communist admission are to be achieved not by peaceful exercise of the ballot under constitutional right, but by revolutionary upheavals, by fomenting class hatred, by incitement to class warfare and by other illegal, as well as by legal, methods. The tactics and specific stages to be followed for the accomplishment of this end are set forth in circumstantial detail in the official program of the American Communist Party adopted at the convention held at Cleveland on April 2 to 8, 1934.

"The 'manifesto' and the 'resolutions' incite to civil war by requiring one class 'to take power' by direct revolutionary process and then assume dictatorship over the country in the manner followed by the Communists in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which is frequently mentioned as a guiding example.

"In pursuance of the revolutionary way to power, the program instructs members of the party to obtain a foothold in the Army and the Navy and develop 'revolutionary mass organizations in the decisive war industries and in the harbors.' The trade unions should be undermined and utilized as recruiting grounds for revolutionary workers. How faithfully these particular injunctions have been executed was demonstrated by Navy officers appearing before the committee and by officials of the American Federation of Labor.

"The American Communist Party is affiliated with the Third International, which was created by officials of the Soviet Government and is still housed in Moscow with governmental approval and cooperation. This affiliation is not one of general sympathy or broad uniformity of purpose and program: it is of a definitely organic character involving specific jurisdiction on the part of the governing body over the Communist Party of the United States.

"The executive secretary of the Communist Party of the United States testified to this committee that his party was 'a section of the Communist International,' that it participates in all the gatherings which decide the policies of the Communist International and sends delegates to the various conferences in Moscow." This admission is confirmed by the records available.

The following is taken from Exhibit 4 (Why Communism), one of the most outstanding authorities accepted by the Communist Party on the ultimate aim of the Communist Party in America:

"We propose in brief, that all resources, all land and buildings, all manufacturing establishments, mines, railroads and other means of transportation and communication, should be, not private property, but common property of all those who work. We propose that production be made to serve the needs of all those who work, rather than to serve the enrichment of a few parasites. We propose that parasitism should be abolished altogether and that society should consist only of those who work, which means that all members of society should be socially useful human beings. We hold with science that production and distribution of goods can be planned to avoid anything resembling the crisis in capitalist society. Planned economy on the basis of common ownership without any class division is called Communism.

"Before we proceed we must say a word or two about the idea of having planned economy under capitalism.

"If planning means anything, it means organization of human activities in a certain direction to achieve a definite and clear-cut aim. Planning a garden means undertaking a number of steps—like preparing the ground, the seeds, the fences, putting the seeds into the ground, etc.—which will ultimately result in a garden. You cannot say you are planning a garden when your aim is rabbit shooting. You do not plan a garden when you think of digging into the ground for gold. This is so obvious that it does not need any proof. The aim is what determines the plan. The aim of planned economy should be to satisfy the needs of the population by setting into motion all the production forces of the country, or even of the whole world. To secure a decent living for everybody—that is the aim. To organize all economic activities accordingly—that is the plan.

"But the aim of capitalism is not to secure a decent living for all. The aim of capitalism is to secure—as they say—'reasonable profit' on investments. Profits come first. The people come last. A 'reasonable profit' is a profit that looks reasonable to the owners of wealth—and that means all the traffic will bear. The needs of the population are mentioned in speeches—but they do not determine the actions of those who rule.

"Communism compared to capitalism is like capitalism compared to the economy of the native Indian population of three centuries ago. Communism builds. It encourages scientific advance on a colossal scale. It makes man complete master of nature and of the social system. It reduces labor to the easy task of supervising machinery a few hours every day. It leaves mankind free to engage in the higher intellectual pursuits. It makes every worker a highly cultured being and everybody responsible for the welfare of all. It insures on its portals: Let everybody work according to his ability; let everybody receive from the common stock of goods according to his needs. In the lower stage of communism called socialism, the rule is that everybody receives according to his work; but here too there is no exploitation, no oppression, no insecurity, no poverty, but everybody is working and work is made the badge of honor. Life is made humane. With this begins the great ascent of man.

"But isn't it a utopia? Aren't those Communist dreamers? We propose to show that the Communists are the greatest realists, that the program advanced by them are already in operation.

"*The state democracy.*—The truth of the matter is that this is a rich man's state and a rich man's government. The state is there to act on behalf of finance capital and to protect its interests against the people. The government is the executive committee of the big trusts.

"You, an American worker, may be shocked to hear such a statement. You have been fed so much 'democracy' bunk that you think it almost sacrilege to reveal the true nature of the State. This is exactly what your masters are after with their propaganda. They want you to believe that the State is holy and that its high functionaries are like saints surrounded by halos. All the pulpits, schools, newspapers, radio, lectures, moving pictures, and other sources of information controlled by big business are engaged in giving you false notions about the State. Yet consider for a moment the simple fact that 1 percent of the population controls nearly two-thirds of the Nation's wealth—and it will not be difficult for you to realize that the individuals composing this 1 percent must have vastly more power than the men composing the 87 percent of the population who own, together only 10 percent of the national wealth. Compare your own influence with the influence of the big banker of your community in dealing with the precinct policeman, the police captain, the judge, the prison warden, the governor, the legislature. Why a plain worker doesn't count at all when it comes to what they call the seats of power.

"The State is an instrument of power in the hands of the big industrialists, bankers, and landlords, who by this token are the ruling class. The State is there to effect the exploitation and oppression of the workers and the poor and small farmers, and also of the subjugated colonial peoples by the ruling class. The Constitution, the Government, its laws, its agencies; the Army, the militia, the police, the courts, the jails, the legislatures—all are there to effect the exploitation and oppression of you and millions like you.

"We know you, an American worker, may hate to call yourself 'exploited' and 'oppressed.' You have been taught false pride, not the pride of refusing to be exploited, but the pride of refusing to admit that you are exploited. Your refusal, however, does not change the fact that the coal barons squeeze the last drop of your blood for the sake of their profits and that when you go out on strike the State sends its deputy sheriffs and militia to crush your resistance. Here, in labor disputes, you can easily recognize the State as the executive committee and the strong arm of the entrenched wealth.

"Class war. We communists do not like the expression, 'labor disputes.' It suggests a disagreement among people on an equal basis. It suggests a friendly bickering of parties to an agreement who happen to disagree on a certain point. It suggests an amicable and perfectly lovely settlement of mutual grievances. What a false and misleading notion! There are no labor disputes. There is the wish of the capitalist to press some more sweat and blood out of the workers, and there is the wish of the workers to fight their enemy, who feeds on them. There is war. It is class war. It is waged by the representatives of one class, the oppressors, against the mass of another class, the oppressed. In this war, the State is always and invariably on the side of the oppressors. Some of its representatives may try to achieve the ends of capital by cajoling and wheedling. But they always keep the big stick of the big corporations ready. The State—that is the big stick of the owners of wealth, the big stick of the big corporations.

"This is the only realistic view of the State. Every one who tries to persuade you that the State is your friend, your defender, that the State is impartial and only 'regulatory,' is misleading.

"We hear Roosevelt saying the State protects both industry and labor. But under capitalism you cannot protect both 'industry' (meaning the capitalists) and labor (meaning the workers)! When you protect labor you make it possible for labor to get more out of industry. You cannot keep fire and water reconciled.

"In reality the state under Roosevelt is a more efficient instrument at the service of his capital than under Hoover. All these administrators, adjusters, and consolidators are nothing but agents of the State serving the interests of big business. The States locally are especial instruments of the capitalists. The militia is rampant everywhere. Sheriffs are breaking up strikes. Policemen are carrying out evictions. Militant workers are being imprisoned for strike activity. Unemployed workers and their leaders are being clubbed and jailed for demanding relief. Negroes are lynched under the benevolent guardianship of the State.

"You were told that the State under the New Deal guarantees you the right of collective bargaining. Section 7a of the National Industrial Recovery Act, you were told, guaranteed the workers the right to bargain collectively through representatives 'of their own choosing.' But the State helped the manufacturers to use this very section to organize company unions which carry out the will of the employer. Section 7a has been used, says a former Government agent, Thompson, appointed by Roosevelt to investigate the N. R. A., 'to force through compulsory arbitration and company unionism.' As to enforcement of section 7a, that is to say, punishing those bosses who do not carry out the provisions of the N. R. A., Mr. Biddle, chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, declared in a report, March 13, 1935, that 'enforcement had virtually been suspended.' That in no case except one had suit been brought against an employer and that in the one exception the employer had been found not guilty.

"The State under the New Deal has greatly increased its machinery which is working overtime against the workers. The State has incorporated into its boards a number of important reformists leaders; the N. R. A. is supported by most of the leadership of the A. F. of L. With their open or covert aid, the State has broken many a splendid strike and robbed the workers of the fruit of many a valiant struggle by dispatching against them either armed men or 'mediators' or both.

"If you, a worker, fail to realize that these bluecoats and district attorneys, judges, and prison wardens, governors, and presidents, generals and admirals, 'mediators' and 'arbitrators,' together with the gentlemen in the legislatures, States and Federal, are nothing but the corps of agents of big capital, you are merely reacting the way these gentry wish you to.

"The Communists are the only group in present-day society who recognize the basic nature of the capitalist state. The state may change its appearance and its appendices. It may use the parliamentary system, with a limited freedom of speech to opponents—as long as this opposition is not too dangerous. It tightens the screws and tries to silence the opposition when the situation becomes disturbing for big capital—as this was done during the war under Wilson. It may do away with parliamentary procedure altogether and institute an open reign of terror when danger to capitalism becomes particularly acute due to the rising tide of the revolutionary labor movement in Fascist Germany. The forms change. The phraseology differs according to time and place. The essence remains. The essence of the capitalist state is service in the employ of capitalism for the preservation of capitalism."

The ultimate aim of the Communist Party is clearly defined in the Communist Booklet (program of the Communist International) marked as "Exhibit 10."

"The ultimate aim of the Communist International is to replace world capitalist economy by a world system of communism."

The changes of economic ownership and confiscation (abolition of private property) is expressed within the following quotation taken from exhibit 7 (program of the Communists, by N. Bucharin).

"Only by means of a civil war and the Iron dictatorship of the proletariat can we achieve a cooperative communistic production. Destruction of the bourgeois state, workers' dictatorship, expropriation of the capitalist class of the production by the working class, a free road to communism, that is the program of the Communist Party."

The ultimate aim of the Communist Party is embodied within the following quotation taken from exhibit 3 (Theses, Statutes, and Conditions of Admission To the Third International).

"Only a violent defeat of the bourgeoisie, confiscation of its property, annihilation of the entire bourgeois government apparatus, parliamentary, judiciary, military, bureaucratic, administrative, municipal, etc., even the individual exile or interment of the most stubborn and dangerous exploiters, the establishment of a strict control over them for the repression of all inevitable attempts at resistance and restoration of capitalistic slavery—only such measures will be able to guarantee the complete submission of the whole class of exploiters."

In the above, we see to what extremes a victorious Communist Party would go, to preserve its position of mastery over a defeated democratic America.

A few excerpts from exhibit 8 (acceptance speeches of William Z. Foster and James Ford, Communist candidates for President and Vice President), respectively, follow:

"It is important to build up a strong Communist vote in order to organize and measure the sentiment of the masses and elect representatives to the capitalistic Government, not in the illusion that workers can 'peacefully' capture the Government, but to enable them to better expose the capitalistic Government, to wring concessions from the employers and to bring the communistic program forcefully before the masses.

"Capitalism must be overthrown, the industries and lands socialized, exploitation abolished and socialism established. The Communist Party fights to establish a workers' and farmers' government, it struggles ever and always for a United Soviet States of America.

"Capitalism will not die. It must be killed—and the workers of the world are getting ready to kill it.

"It is the aim of the Communist Party to expropriate the expropriators; that is, to confiscate without remuneration the great industries and the big land holdings from the parasitic class, who now own them. The revolutionary workers' and farmers' government will never pay the capitalists for the great industrial and natural resources of the country."

We now introduce excerpts from the Manifesto of the Communist Party, and request it to be marked "Exhibit 17."

"The immediate aim of the Communists, is the same as that of all the other proletarian parties. Formation of the proletariat into a class—overthrow of bourgeois supremacy—conquest of political power by the proletariat.

"In this sense, the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence—abolition of private property.

"In a word, you reproach us with intending to do away with private property. Precisely so—that is just what we intend."

V. BORING FROM WITHIN

In the instructions to the Communists in America by Lenin, we see what the greatest authority on communism has to say on the method of boring from within. We introduce Lenin's instructions to the Communists in America, and ask that they be marked "Exhibit 18."

"Union of Communists and non-Communists is absolutely necessary. One of the most serious and dangerous mistakes Communists can make is to imagine that a revolution can be accomplished by the hands of revolutionists alone. On the contrary, in order that serious revolutionary work may be successful, it is necessary to understand and be guided by the fact that revolutionists can only play the role of the vanguard of the really advanced and progressive class. The vanguard fulfills its tasks as such only when it is able to keep in touch with the masses it leads, and actually leads the whole mass forward. Without a union with non-Communists in the most varied fields of activity, successful Communist constructive effort is out of the question.

"Every sacrifice must be made, the greatest obstacles must be overcome in order to carry on agitation and propaganda systematically, stubbornly, insistently, and patiently, precisely in all those institutions, societies, and associations to which proletarian or semi-proletarian masses belong, however ultrareactionary they may be. And the trade unions and workers cooperatives, are precisely the organizations in which the masses are to be found.

"The main task of contemporary communism in Western Europe and America is to acquire the ability to seek, to find, to determine correctly the concrete path, or the particular turn of events that will bring the masses right up to the real, decisive, last, and great revolutionary struggle.

Dimitroff, secretary of the Comintern, has this to say on "Boring From Within" taken from exhibit 4 (Why Communism).

"We must infatigably prepare the working class for a rapid change in forms and methods of struggle when there is a change in the situation. As the movement grows there is a change in the situation and the unity of the working class strengthens, we must go further, and prepare the transition from the defensive to the offensive against capital, steering toward the organization of a mass political strike. It must be an absolute condition of such a strike, to draw into it the main trade unions of the respective countries."

We now introduce the American Legion report and ask that it be marked "Exhibit 19."

"Moscow, July 28.—The opening report of Wilhelm Pieck at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International was delivered in the forenoon session, July 26. A comprehensive summary of Pieck's report in the name of the executive committee of the Comintern follows:

"The Sixth World Congress has the question of the future international development of economy.

"The social-democrats foresaw a period of perpetual prosperity. The right opportunists in the Communist International had the perspective of the further strengthening of capitalist stabilization. All the Sixth Congress the initiative of Stalin foreshaw the sharpening of all the contradictions of capitalism and the new revolutionary trend, shattering capitalist stabilization, and this was what happened.

"Shortly after the Sixth Congress began, unparalleled strikes took place in many countries and the antiimperialist movements in China and India grew in strength. Capitalist production continued strongly, but by means of rationalization and increased unemployment. Social-democracy involved itself ever more with the capitalist state and with the industrial apparatus and ever more drove the economic struggle of the workers in the background.

"*Class against class.*—Out of this situation arose the Communist opposition, tactics, 'class against class,' against Socialist bourgeoisie policies. This Communist tactic in nowise contradicted the united front; however, in carrying it out, sectarian mistakes occurred. It was correct sharply to differentiate the Communist Party from the Social-Democratic Party, but it was also incorrect to isolate it from the Socialist workers.

"Without a loosening of the reformist trade-union discipline, without an independent Communist strike leadership, the bourgeoisie could have carried out its wide plans of wage cuts even in periods of the greatest economic activity, and there would have been neither a Lodz strike nor the struggle in the Ruhr; many workers would have left the movement disgusted. However, some Communists did not understand how to crystallize their influence in the reformist unions and among the unorganized.

"It was correct for the 'Red' International of Labor Unions to struggle against the hegemony of the reformist leadership, but the Strassbourg Conference resolutions in 1929 for independent leadership 'in spite of and against the reformist unions' was incorrect. It was correct to oppose the Brandler theory of 'compelling the Bonzes,' but it was incorrect to say that no influence could or should be brought to bear on the bureaucrats through the membership. While correctly fighting the mass-expulsion policies of the bureaucrats, we still made mistakes in transforming the 'red' union opposition into new unions, and especially bad was the sectarianism in England, where the trade unionists were soaked in the old trade-union traditions. Yet it is a fact that even during this period, before the crisis the Communists were the principal leaders of strikes in several countries.

"The world crisis.—The crisis of 1929 brought unspeakable misery to millions of workers, farmers, and members of petty bourgeoisie, and also increased the exploitation of the colonial peoples. A furious armaments race commences. Japan seizes Manchuria, Bolivia and Paraguay are at war, Fascist dictatorship is set in Germany. These were accompanied by sharp class battles in Spain and China, the swelling up of antiimperialist and agrarian revolutionary struggles, the formation of Soviets, the establishment of the mighty 'red' Army of China and the peasant uprising in Indo-China.

"The twelfth plenum of the E. C. C. I. could say in 1932 that the temporary stabilization of capitalism was ended and a new period of wars and revolutions was approaching. The Soviet Union showed the example. The tasks of the Communists lay in the organization of the masses for a struggle for any advantage, however slight, and for carrying on the drive against fascism, against finance capital and for proletarian dictatorship. The tactical task was to prevent the placing of the burden of the crisis on the shoulders of the masses. The strategic center of the struggle was Germany. The Communists succeeded in mitigating the lot of large numbers of the unemployed through this struggle. Sabotage by social-democrats prevented the still further progress of the struggle.

"Growth of political struggles.—The Communists also, despite their hard struggle, failed to use all possible methods. While the social-democrats preached the doctrine that the crisis was abating, the workers were engaged in continuous struggles. However, there was a failure sufficient to unite the actions of the workers and the unemployed.

"A whole series of political struggles flared up in Germany, the United States, and Hungary; there were farmers' strikes and veterans' marches in the United States, the Spanish revolution, the strike at Invergordon of the British naval sailors, the mutiny of the Chilean fleet, the peasant uprising in the Polish Ukraine, the mutiny of the cruiser *Sereni Provinces*. But these did not result in political mass struggle against the capitalist state, and there was also failure in the organization and coordination of forces. There were cases of brilliant organizational work but there was underestimation of the fact which Stalin emphasized in 1925—that the average worker saw his safety in the trade unions, be they good or bad; in the United States for a long time Communists considered the American Federation of Labor as only a strike-breaking organization and saw only Green and such leaders and overlooked the average member.

"Underestimation of fascism.—A great mistake was underestimation of the Fascist danger, but on the other hand fascism was seen where it did not exist. There was the failure to win as allies to the proletariat, farmers and the petty bourgeoisie.

"The weaknesses of the working class were caused by the splitting and the treachery of social-democracy, which enabled the bourgeoisie to deceive the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry and to use them in launching the Fascist offensive. In order to avoid the Fascist catastrophe in Germany there was needed a broad united front and the "Red" front organization should have formed a united fighting organization with the Reichsbanner. They should have been able to force the Weimar government to disarm the Fascist bands and tear up the Versailles Treaty.

"The majority of the workers did not do this, and instead blindly followed the social-democratic leaders, despite the Communists' warnings.

"The Communists alone were not able to ward off the catastrophe, although they mobilized all their strength in the struggle for the united front and sought at any cost to arrive at an agreement with the Socialist Party and the reformist trade unions. The social-democrats rejected every proposal, even on July 20, 1932, and on January 30, 1933, when the Communists proposed a general strike."

"Communists oppose adventurism.—The Communists do not desire that trained revolutionists shall be sacrificed merely to show their heroism but instead that they shall organize new struggles and win new victories.

"In spite of the temporary retardation of the growth of the revolutionary movement, the workers of various countries have won big victories, as in China, Spain, the Soviet 5-year plan, etc. There was increased revolutionary strength and determination to fight for Soviet power among the toilers of the whole world.

"Although the crisis changed to a depression, the bourgeoisie did not succeed in weakening the revolutionary world front. The victory of fascism does not bring in a long period of reaction, as the social-democrats predicted, but rather as Stalin said at the Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, 'The idea of storming the citadel of capitalism is ripening in the minds of the masses,' and it is spreading also among the broad masses of the social-democracy. The first expression of this was in the world united front for the Leipzig trial defendants, where Dimitroff's courageous defense of communism played a great role, and in other significant struggles."

"United-front achievements.—In England and America the Communist parties strengthened the proletariat and increased their influence by correct united-front tactics. Under pressure of the masses in Poland various social-democratic organizations formed a united front with Communists. On the initiative of the Communist parties there was a welling up of political strikes and peasant movements, resulting in the further revolutionizing of the social-democratic masses and in the further building up of the united front.

"The united-front movement takes many forms in various capitalist countries. Antiworking class Socialists in the Government of Czechoslovakia and in the Scandinavian countries made the masses conscious that social-democratic ministers are no protection against fascism, war, and the capitalist offensive. Especially important are the results of the united front in the Fascist countries of Germany, Hungary, Italy, and Poland."

The following quotation taken from exhibit 16 (Report No. 153, submitted to the Congress of the United States, February 15, 1935) is another reason why we should be alert always as to the Communist Party and its activities.

"In the United States there are many organizations which are either Communist or sympathetic to the Communist program or to some of its affiliated groups. The harmless-sounding names seldom do justice to their activities."

These organizations operate among employed and unemployed in the United States of America. Others represent the cultural groups and any movement which has as its aim the spreading of discord and discontent among the people in general. A great many people are brought into these organizations without being aware of the real purpose which the organizations stand for. This is real deceit and fraud.

The program of the Seventh World Congress is expressed by the principles as enunciated by the Communist manifesto of Carl Marx and Frederick Engels and the teachings of Lenin. This is shown by the article written by Earl Browder, secretary of the Communist Party in the United States, in the December 1935 edition of *The Communist*. The article is under the title: "The United Front—The Key to Our New Tactical Orientation," entered herewith as exhibit 20.

"Comrades, we open this plenum of the central committee with the main political report already before the party. This is in the form of the Seventh World Congress reports. Chief of these is Dimitroff's report, of which over 400,000 copies have already been distributed in this country. The proposed application of the line of the congress to the United States of America, which was submitted to the congress by the American delegation and approved, has also been in the hands of the party for many weeks. Oral reports by the returned delegates have been made to packed halls in almost all of the important cities. In these meetings we had a mass demonstration of approval

of the Seventh World Congress decisions on a scale unprecedented in our movement.

"Thus, the basic preparatory work of our plenum is thoroughly done. The line is clearly laid down. The enthusiastic endorsement by our party has been completely expressed. What we must do at this plenum is to proceed deeper and in more detail to the application of this line to the concrete problems of our movement, and to discuss as thoroughly as time will permit all of the tasks of applying this line in everyday life, of meeting and overcoming all the difficulties, answering all of the arguments that arise in the minds of our party members, our sympathizers, and of the broad masses generally.

"First, of course, we must again speak about the significance of the Seventh World Congress and again evaluate this congress in the light of its effect upon our movement, and the outstanding feature of this congress which becomes more and more apparent as time goes on.

"THE NEW TACTICAL ORIENTATION FORMULATED BY THE COMINTERN

"The Seventh World Congress formulated a new tactical orientation for our party, an orientation suited to the new developments in the world situation.

"When we say that, we are met with two sorts of arguments from certain quarters. The general type of these arguments is indicated, on the one hand, by those who say: 'So, you admit that your old orientation was wrong'; the second is, 'Never mind "new orientation"—that is bluff, the Communists have changed nothing.'

"The first argument says that by adopting a new tactical orientation the Communists are admitting, whether they want to or not, that their old tactical orientation was wrong and had to be changed because it was wrong. To this our answer is: Not at all. The Seventh World Congress formulated a new tactical line because new conditions have arisen, not because the old line was wrong. The Communists are Marxists, Leninists, Stalinists. We adopt new tactics again when changing conditions will demand it. What Communists do not change, of course, is their strategic aim—the proletarian revolution and socialism. Naturally, the Seventh World Congress made no change in that at all. On the contrary, it equipped the working-class vanguard with such a tactical line as will enable them to fight most effectively for this aim in the present world situation. * * *"

"THE SOVIET UNION—THE BULWARK OF STRENGTH AGAINST FASCISM AND WAR

"* * * That is why the Seventh World Congress formulated the new tactical orientation which sees the final and irrevocable victory of socialism, the inability of the bourgeoisie to overcome the collapse of capitalist stabilization and the growing urge of the Socialists and trade unionists for the united front—all these enabling the working class to carry on an active revolutionary policy, weakening the position of the bourgeoisie and strengthening the positions of the working class.

"But this objective will not be reached automatically. The conditions are now such that the Communists must and can assume responsibility for the fate and well-being of the working class and of all toilers today and every day. This means, however, that we must break with the remnants of the old method of mere propaganda; it means that we must thoroughly eradicate all remnants of the old traditions that we are only an opposition that has little to offer the masses until the revolution becomes mature. It is true that we have already moved away from such conceptions. But in actual methods of approach and work, we still meet all too often the attitude of pure revolutionary opposition to the Socialist Party and to the reformist leaders of mass organizations of the workers. We must say: No; we are not merely a revolutionary opposition, we are a political party whose aim is the proletarian revolution, soviet power, and socialism, and because of this we are advocated of an active revolutionary and practical policy for today and every day, a policy of the day which the American proletariat can accept as its own, and by so doing can exercise a decisive influence in the affairs of America and of the world.

"What must we do? We must find that decisive link in the present class struggle which will enable us best to prepare the toilers for the coming great battles of the second round of revolutions. And what is that link? It is the united front against fascism and war.

"FOR THE POLITICAL UNITY OF THE PROLETARIAT"

"The new tactical orientation of the Seventh World Congress—this is the link that will lead us to the next link, the united party of the proletariat. It is the link that will fuse the proletariat into a single mass political army and will insure its victory in the struggle against fascism, against the power of capital, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, and for the power of the soviets.

"It is clear that the tactics of the Seventh World Congress give us a most powerful weapon for the building and strengthening of the Communist Party, for the development of broader and better Bolshevik cadres, and for the realization of the political unity of the proletariat. * * *

"You are already acquainted with the practical and effective policies for trade-union unity worked out by the congress. Here it is important to recognize the tremendous effect these decisions already have had. The movement for trade-union unity nationally and internationally has received an enormous push forward. We can see it in France, where unity is about to be concluded. We can see it in the strengthening of the demand for trade-union unity by the rank and file, by genuine progressive trade unionists everywhere.

"Another thing should be emphasized: the united front between Socialists and Communists exercises a powerful influence in speeding up trade-union unity. It is beyond doubt one of the most potent means of strengthening the proletariat against the capitalist offensive, against fascism and war.

"THE UNITED FRONT—THE CHIEF REQUIREMENT OF THE PROLETARIAN PEACE POLICY"

"Much also has been said by our enemies to discredit the peace strategy of the Seventh Congress of the C. I., especially its rallying call to the toilers of all countries to defend the Soviet Union, the bulwark of socialism and peace. We must say that no matter how much misrepresentation and slander are directed against this slogan, it is unable to obscure for the masses the main idea, that idea from which everything else flows, the idea which is more and more enthusiastically received by growing numbers of workers and toilers throughout the world, not only Communists and sympathizers, Socialists, nonparty trade unionists and others—the plain, crystal clear, world-shaking proposition which says: 'If the commencement of a counter-revolutionary war forces the Soviet Union to set the workers' and peasants' Red Army in motion for the defense of socialism, then the Communists will call upon all toilers to work with all means at their disposal and at any price for the victory of the Red Army over the armies of the imperialists.'

"*The need for rapid, systematic recruiting.*—Our party in the United States consists of some 30,000 members. This is indeed a very important force, but a very small number indeed for a country like the United States. This number in no way corresponds to the needs of the present situation, even to the growing influence of our party among the masses. There will be a special report on this question and proposals for more rapid, systematic recruitment. I merely wish to raise this point briefly to emphasize the need for mass recruitment. If in the past we have put the question How do we succeed in keeping so many militant workers out of the party?, I think we can put this question again with greater force today. None of us here will deny that in the factories, in the trade unions, among the masses, generally, we see daily fresh militant workers coming to the front in battle against the class enemy. Why don't we win all of these forces to our party? We have them in the struggles of the Negro masses, in the struggles of the farmers, in strike struggles. We do not yet get all of these, nor most of these, nor even a considerable section of these workers into our ranks, because we have not yet overcome our old sectarian policy, habits, and methods of work.

"With the tactical reorientation, our efforts will meet with greater success; but there is the question of organization. It is not enough to have improvement in the agitation, in the general activity. We must organize our efforts to guarantee consistent, systematic, sustained contact with these workers, to help them in their work, discuss with them, listen to their grievances against us—and sometimes they have very justified grievances against us, which they talk about widely among broad sections of workers—and thus by listening to them, by helping them, bring them closer to us, and finally into the party.

"Recruiting into the party is not a simple act of conversion that takes place in an instant; it is a long process that we must develop systematically, step

by step. Some time ago the central committee addressed a letter to every party member on this question, on the methods of recruiting. * * *

Conclusion.—Comrades, this report, as you see, has merely been the enlargement or the digging deep at the roots of our problems, to find the application of the line of the Seventh World Congress to our specific situation, our specific tasks in the United States. We have in this report concentrated on just a few leading questions and tried to go as deep as possible into them in terms of the daily life of our movement, to answer the questions that come up every day among the masses, among whom we must work. The purpose of this report is to make it easier for all of us unitedly to carry through the historic decisions of the Seventh World Congress, the decisions which are already shaping the lives of the millions of masses throughout the world, which are bringing into existence much more rapidly than ever before, a great movement for unity and struggle against capitalism and against reaction. This great movement, we know, if we seize upon the key question of everyday life, will lead us surely, step by step, to the victory of our cause, to the victory of socialism all over the world."

In summation of this most enlightening article by Earl Browder, we see that the Seventh World Congress stands for the same principles as the Sixth World Congress. In proof of this we again quote from Mr. Browder.

"The first argument says that by adopting a new tactical orientation the Communists are admitting, whether they want to or not, that their old tactical orientation was wrong and had to be changed because it was wrong. To this our answer is: Not at all. The Seventh World Congress formulated a new tactical line because new conditions have arisen, not because the old line was wrong. The Communists are Marxists, Leninists, Stalinists. We adopt such tactics as best suit the concrete conditions. We will adopt new tactics again when changing conditions will demand it. What Communists do not change, of course, is their strategic aim—the proletarian revolution and socialism. Naturally, the Seventh World Congress made no change in that at all. On the contrary, it equipped the working-class vanguard with such a tactical line as will enable them to fight most effectively for this aim in the present world situation."

VI. ADVOCACY OF FORCE AND VIOLENCE

The Government of the United States of America cannot condemn a political party as illegal no matter what end that political party desires to achieve provided the means advocated or used to the accomplishment of that end are within the bounds laid down by the Constitution.

The first duty of any government, however, is to defend itself from destruction, and the unparalleled executions in the U. S. S. R. are justified by the Communist Party therein on just these grounds. If the Communist Party U. S. A. Section Communist International does not advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, then it has the constitutional right to declare and work for its ultimate aim which we have shown to be the establishment of a soviet state.

It is our contention, however, that the Communist Party U. S. A. Section Communist International has no such pacific intent. We will prove that it recognizes the fact that it can never conquer the majority of the population of the U. S. A. by force of logic and reasoning, and that its only hope is to accomplish it by force and violence. It argues in rather a specious manner that if there is force and violence during its attempt to accomplish the soviet state that such force and violence will arise from the people who protest that form of government, and that all that is necessary to maintain peace is quiet abdication to the dictatorship of the proletariat. This reasoning, however, contains a threat and that threat is that when the demand is made upon the people of the United States to deliver our Government to the dictatorship of the proletariat that they must do so peacefully or else suffer the violent consequences.

We are also told that there must be, upon the soviet state being established, an immediate liquidation of the bourgeoisie class. The evidence already given regarding the formation of the Third Communist International and the historical events of the world following it proves that the word "liquidation" actually means physical annihilation. This of itself shows that the bourgeoisie is going to put up physical resistance when the alternative of the soviet state is thrust upon them. So violence is inevitable and that violence will arise

with the result of activities of the Communist Party within the United States of America.

The question of force and violence as an integral part of the Communist program has been widely discussed. On this question the Hon. Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, in a memorandum submitted to the Senate said: "It will be seen that the question of whether Communist programs contemplate the use of force and violence has been passed upon by every class of tribunal which could pass upon it, namely, Federal and State courts, administrative and legislative committees of both Federal and State governments, and in every case the result has been in support of the position that force and violence are inseparable from Communist programs."

We now refer you again to the book entitled "Why Communism" by M. G. Olgin, heretofore introduced as exhibit 4, and quote therefrom as follows: "On the question of the state the Communists naturally and unavoidably come into clash with other political parties. The question is put squarely: Can the working people achieve their liberties by merely using the state machinery of capitalism? To this question the liberals answer in the affirmative; the reformists union leaders answer in the affirmative; the Socialists answer in the affirmative; the Communists answer in the negative.

"The liberals are dissatisfied with the functions of the State. They point out its 'shortcomings.' They do not close their eyes to the fact that there is inequality. They know the war-breeding nature of the capitalist state. But what do they propose to do? They propose a little tinkering here and there. Direct primaries were one act of such tinkering. The abolition of the lame duck session is another. The initiative and referendum is a third. But that has nothing to do with the very nature of the state as a bulwark of private property and capitalist exploitation.

"An improvement in the electoral laws, and extension of the freedom of the press, no matter how important for the working class, does not touch upon the fundamentals of the capitalist state, namely, its being an instrument of power in the hands of the big owners of wealth. Improve the state—and you have made it more flexible, more capable of adapting itself to circumstances; you have made it a better instrument of oppression.

"The American labor leaders of the William Green, Mathew Woll, and John L. Lewis type do not wish to have a revolutionary political party organized to defend the interests of the working class. They are not opposed to the capitalist system even in words. They pronounce to support such representatives of the Republican and Democratic Parties as are willing to introduce reform on behalf of labor.

"Not much breath need be wasted on the program of the labor leaders of 'punishing enemies and rewarding friends.' The Republican and Democratic Parties are the parties of big capital. They may fight one another at elections for the control of the administration, but they differ little from one another and they do the bidding of the big trusts. Their treasuries are filled from the coffers of the big industries and bankers, and quite often their chief leaders are themselves big industrialists or bankers or both (Andrew Mellon, Charles Dawes, the late Dwight Morrow in the Republican Party; Owen D. Young, John Raskob, Bernard Baruch in the Democratic party). To expect that the gentlemen of these parties will help the workers achieve their end is to expect that the leopard will change its spots.

"The Socialists on the other hand have their own political party and they claim to be opposed to the capitalist system. They sometimes wax eloquent in denouncing the evils of the capitalist system. But what do they propose? They propose to 'improve' the capitalistic state so as to make it an instrument for doing away with private ownership of wealth. In other words, they preach the nonsense of turning the exploiters club by the power of prayer into a rosebush. Since this 'theory' appears in the garb of socialism and since there are a number of workers who lend it their ear, it is necessary to dwell on it a little longer.

"Need of revolution: The Socialists say there is no need of a revolution. They say democracy has prepared for the workers all the means necessary to achieve socialism. Let the workers use universal suffrage, they say, to send Socialists into the legislative assemblies. Let the Socialists form a majority in these assemblies. When this is done, the road is open to pass laws abolishing capitalistic system. Of course there is the Federal Constitution which prohibits the confiscation of property by legal procedure, but this, says the leader of

American Socialists, Mr. Norman Thomas, can be overcome. Let us have a Constitutional Convention to amend the Constitution so as to permit Congress to enact social legislation. Let Congress then enact a law which orders the big corporations to cede their industries and all their property to the state. Let us not expropriate them, say the Socialists, not by any means! Let us pay them with bonds issued by the Government and redeemable in 30 years. This will mean introducing socialism by pacific methods. No revolutions; no seizure of power; no infringement upon the law; no mass action; no expropriation of exploiters. Everything lawful. Everything in a gentlemanly fashion. The electoral law works. The citizens vote. The legislators assemble. They count noses and find a Socialist majority. The Socialist majority, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, passes a law. Capitalism passes out. The big trusts bow before the will of the people. 'Gentlemen, you are the lawful heirs of our system,' they say politely, and leave the stage for the Norman Thomases and their associates.

"What a sweet picture! And how deceptive! We are sorry to make such an idyllic scene. But we Communists are realists, and we do not wish to be carried away by fancies, especially when these fancies are beneficial to the capitalist system as they tend to keep workers from fighting the capitalist state.

"Let us not argue at length about the ingenious invention of paying the owners of industrial establishments with bonds, which means recognizing that the exploiters are entitled to their monopoly of the means of production and that, if they are to give them up, it is to be only through sale. It is not really difficult to see that if you pay your exploiters with bonds, you continue their exploitation in another form. You may have taken over the factories but you still continue working for the profits of the former owners. Everybody can see that. Let us rather examine the proposal of introducing socialism by means of the ballot.

"What does the State consist of? It consists not only of the legislatures which, by the way, play a lesser and lesser role as big monopoly capitalism grows. It consists first of all of the Army with its commanding staff, the militia, the police force, and the executive branch of the Government which uses the armed forces to achieve the ends of capitalism. Is it possible to get a majority of Socialist Congressmen? Even assuming that such a miracle would happen, it still wouldn't spell socialism. Even before there is any danger of a majority of Socialists actually ready to legislate socialism, the electoral laws can be changed to prevent such an emergency. Even were a Socialist majority to convene, their decisions may not be carried out. One squad of soldiers is sufficient to disperse an entire legislative assembly the way this was done in Italy, in Germany, and in many other countries.

"In case of a Socialist majority, we have before us one of two possibilities. Either the capitalists are certain that the Socialist leaders are harmless to capitalism—as was the case on numerous occasions in Germany and England when power was in the hands of the Socialists leaders; in such a case they will rather be glad to have them carry the burden of government for capitalism; or the capitalists do not like the Socialist majority, because it suits their interests better to have an open dictatorship—and they will use every means to get rid of unwelcome legislators.

"Remember that the Socialists are against revolutionary methods. Remember that they do not appeal to the masses to offer resistance against brutal capitalist oppression. And do not forget that capitalism is armed to the teeth and that it will use its armed force to secure its domination. Capitalism never gives up its wealth and power voluntarily and it has little respect for its own laws when it comes to defend its rule.

"He who says that you use the capitalist state to abolish capitalism verily resembles one who says you can demolish the enemy fortress by the sounds of the trumpets.

"It would seem at first glance that the Socialists are merely engaged in day dreaming. Unfortunately, it isn't as harmless as that. The activities of the Socialist leaders are actually harmful to the interests of the workers.

"What is the real role of the Socialist leaders? We have no quarrel with those rank-and-file workers who are at heart revolutionists and Socialists, but do not see through the form of Socialist phrases. But we are obliged to point at the pernicious role of the Socialist leaders. At a time when it is necessary for the workers to understand the real nature of the State as an instrument of exploitation and oppression, they tell the workers that the State, as constituted

at present, can be a means of liberating them from exploitation and oppression. At a time when it is necessary for the workers to develop the will to power which shall ultimately crush the capitalist state and make workers and farmers the ruling power in a state of their own making, the Socialists tell the workers that nothing of the kind is needed and that they have to remain within legal limits prescribed for them by the ruling class.

"The capitalist state is a glaring fact. It is flesh and blood of the capitalist system. It stands in the way of the workers' progress towards a new free life. Can it be abolished by gradual transformation? Those who say it can are the staunchest supporters of the capitalist robbers and the most active promoters of imperialist wars. Their theory is not harmless, indeed. It is a poisonous theory. It is a smoke screen behind which cruel capitalist exploitation is hiding.

"We Communists say that there is one way to abolish the capitalist state and that is to smash it by force. To make communism possible the workers must take hold of the state machinery of capitalism and destroy it.

"Party argument.

"How can it be done?

"Once you agree that this state is your enemy the answer to the question is not difficult. Once you have freed yourself from the democracy illusion your road is clear.

"Watch the state. Try to understand every one of its moves. The state is often used by the capitalists not only as a big stick but also as a poison gas or as an anesthetic, as in the case under the New Deal. Quite often you are told you are given privileges at the same time that your pockets are being picked. Analyze the functions of the state. Try to understand the forces behind its actions. And remember that if it ever yields anything to the workers it does so under pressure.

"This leads us to the road along which the working class can arrive at the destruction of the capitalist state—revolutionary struggle.

"The working class is placed in this capitalist society in a position where to live it must fight. This fight, to be effective, must be aimed not only at the capitalists but at their state. And once the fight is effective enough it must inevitably lead to the smashing of the state. This is the logic of the class division of today. And this indicates the program of action for the working class for today and tomorrow and the day after tomorrow until the final reckoning with the capitalist system, has arrived—civil war.

"If the workers rise in this way against war, the capitalists with their armed forces will try to break the deadlock. They, with their armed forces, will try to attack the strikers. The workers will have to offer resistance. We Communists do not close our eyes to the fact that this means civil war. But when the masses are organized and fight in great numbers under revolutionary leadership the victory is assured. Part of the Army is certain to waver and join the people. There may be victims, but their number cannot be compared to the losses in life and limb that the workers would suffer in the imperialist war.

"Victory in the civil war spells the doom of the capitalist state.

"We Communists do not say to the workers that they have to begin the civil war today or tomorrow. We say that the civil war is the inevitable outcome of long and arduous struggles against the capitalists and their state and that these struggles must be made the everyday practice of the working class.

"Revolution and the united front.

"Back of all this loose talk about this and that vile Communist plot is a very simple reason. The reformists are afraid of revolution. In this very thing they are entirely subservient to the entire system. They shun everything that may give a jolt to the masters of the land. In the united front they sense an instrument that may cause the rulers no amount of trouble. This they try to avoid. They pretend to be shocked by the 'unreasonableness' of some proposals but they are shocked by the struggle against the capitalist system.

"It may sound comical, but many a reformist is against the demand of high wages or a decent standard of living on the ground the 'business cannot afford to pay that much.' The reformist argues that if the demand is carried business will be 'forced to the wall.' He argues for the exploiters, not for the exploited.

"We Communists say: If the exploiters have created a system which cannot yield profits for them and secure a decent living for all, then why

should the exploited worry about the profits? If the exploiters are forced to the wall because we must live, then let them stay at the wall. All this is not of our making. We do not have to support the exploiters. If they cannot carry on their business under such conditions, somebody will. In fact the workers themselves will carry on the business without profits—for the benefit of all. This, of course, cannot be achieved without revolution. But such is the present situation in America, that the very necessity to live drives the workers to a revolution. There is only one way open for the workers—revolutionary way out of the crisis.

"The reformists are afraid of the united front because that will make the working class more powerful and hence more prepared for the revolutionary battles. The reformist dread an attack on the capitalist system. (They have nothing.) The workers have no stake in this system. They have nothing to lose but their chains. This is why they must join the united front and force their leaders to yield to a united front.

"Overthrow of State power.

"The overthrow of the State power, and with it of the capitalist system grows out of the everyday struggles of the workers.

"As the organization of the workers grows, as their struggles become fiercer, while many nonproletarian elements like farmers, intellectuals, and oppressed members of the lower middle class join the revolutionary movement, the final onslaught on the fortress of capitalism draws nearer. These struggles are the reaction of the masses to the misery wrought by the crisis of capitalism. The capitalists try to overcome the crisis by putting additional burdens on the shoulders of the masses, but they cannot cure the incurable disease. There comes a time when large sections of the population say that this simply 'cannot go on.' The government seems to be entirely incompetent to cope with the political and social difficulties. The belief of the population in the wisdom of the all-powerfulness of the 'men higher up' is shaken. These men are losing their confidence. The confidence of the masses in their own strength is growing apace. The struggles of the masses meanwhile becomes broader and deeper. The government tries suppression. It does not succeed in crushing the spirit of revolt. It cannot stem the tide. The previous struggles of the workers, the more steeled they are in fighting, the better the revolutionary leadership they have developed in the course of the years (the Communist Party), the greater the number of friends they have allied with themselves from among the other oppressed classes, the more capable are they to deal the final blow.

"It is not necessary that this final blow, i. e., the revolution, should come in connection with the imperialist war, although this is very likely. Capitalism will seek to prevent a revolution by plunging this country into war. War is to serve only as a way out of the crisis but as a means to arouse the patriotism of the masses, to increase governmental terror (martial law), and to divert public attention from internal affairs. War under such conditions, for a while retarding the revolutionary movement, may hasten it later when the war sufferings begin to tell on the masses.

"A time comes when there is demoralization above, a growing revolt below; the morale of the Army is also undermined. The old structure of society is tottering. There are actual insurrections, the Army wavers. Panic seizes the rulers. A general uprising begins.

"Workers stop work, many of them seize arms by attacking arsenals. Many had armed themselves before as the struggles sharpened. Street fights become frequent. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the workers organize revolutionary committees to be in command of the uprising. There are battles in the principal cities. Barricades are built and defended. The workers' fighting has a decisive influence with the soldiers. Army units begin to join the revolutionary fighters; there is fraternization between the workers and the soldiers and the marines. The movement among the soldiers and the marines spreads. Capitalism is losing its strongest weapon, the Army. The police, as a rule, continue fighting, but they are soon silenced and made to flee by the united revolutionary forces of workers and soldiers. The revolution is victorious. Armed workers and soldiers and marines seize the principle governmental offices, invade the residences of the President and his Cabinet Members, arrest them, declare the old regime abolished, establish their own power, the power of the workers and farmers.

"Can it be done? It has been done more than once. A workers' revolution broke the backbone of tsarism in Russia in 1905, but was soon defeated. A workers' revolution abolished tsarism in March 1917. * * *

"Our time is a time of workers' revolutions. If not all of the revolutions of the last 15 years succeeded in securing the workers' rule, this was due either to the absence of a strong Communist Party entrenched among the workers, or to the absence of other strong working-class organizations, or to the intervention of foreign imperialists, or to some of these causes both of enemies within the working class betraying the revolution and the leaders of the capitalist forces from without the working class against the revolution—all in the name of democracy and freedom.

"FORCE AND VIOLENCE

"Can a revolution be won? Capitalism creates a situation where large masses of the people are dissatisfied, embittered, emboldened by intolerable hardships. Capitalism itself prepares the conditions for its cataclysm. If under conditions of a severe capitalist crisis the majority of the working class is ready to wage a determined fight for the overthrow of the capitalist system, then the revolution may be victorious, provided there is in existence a mass Communist Party recognized by the workers as their leader in the struggles against capitalism.

"A standard reformist argument against the revolution is: 'The weapons of warfare are so strong in our days that the workers have no chance of winning in open conflict.' The wish of this is father to the thought of the reformists in this respect. Because they hate a revolution of the workers, they maintain that a revolution cannot win. What is true is that a revolution cannot win unless the armed forces, or at least part of them, join the workers. But once they join, the workers have not only rifles and cannons but also airships and poison gas and battleships to fight the bosses. Poison gasses are destructive, to be sure, but their destruction power can be turned also against the enemy when the final conflict has arrived. In all revolutions throughout history the armed forces of the old system were at the beginning stronger than the armed forces of the revolutionists.

"FORCE AND VIOLENCE

"'But this is force and violence,' somebody will contend. 'Don't you Communists know that the use of force and violence is wrong?' We reply to this, first, that if being a red-blooded American means anything, it means that you must not take punishment lying down, that you must offer resistance; secondly, that it is not the workers but the capitalists and their state that start the use of force and violence. When you wish to stay on your place of work and the employer who wants you fired sends for the watchman and has you thrown out, it is he that uses force. When you stay on in the apartment of a house you and the like of you built, and the landlord calls the sheriff to evict you, it is he that uses force. When you go out on a demonstration in the open in front of a governmental office and the Government sends the police and armed thugs to beat you and disperse you, it is the Government that is using force. When you are thrown in jail for refusing to transport ammunition in time of war, it is the Government that is using violence against you. Force and violence are the very essence of the state. When the warehouses are bulging with foodstuffs you and the like of you have produced while you, the hungry, are kept from them by the armed force of watchmen and police, force and violence are used against you. How can you live and breathe if you do not resist? How can you defend your fundamental interests if you do not defy boss restrictions? To defy boss restrictions, to resist attacks of the enemy class, is just as natural for the working class as it is for a red-blooded human being not to take punishment lying down.

"What a picture! Those who live on your sweat and blood tell you it is not 'right' to resist this robbery. Those who hold the big stick over you tell you to be meek as a lamb. Those who make the oppressive laws against you preach among you about the sanctity of the law. This is boss law, boss justice, boss ideas of right and wrong. If the workers were to submit they would not be able to live; they would be reduced to something worse than chattel slavery.

"RESPECT FOR LAW"

"We Communists say the workers cannot have respect for boss law and boss morality directed against them. The class interests of the working class—these are the supreme law for the workers. Defending their lives and their future, they must inevitably come into conflict with boss law. Defending their very lives, they are driven to stand up against boss force. Fighting against the boss system, they are defending not only their own class interests but the interests of the mankind. For capitalism has reduced mankind to a state of chronic misery, poverty, insecurity, fear, periodic carnage, insane luxury for the few, hunger and degradation for the many—a state that simply cannot continue if mankind is to progress. Capitalism is decaying, and to save humanity this putrid wound on its body must be removed.

"When you fight capitalism you are doing what is right and just and lawful from the point of view of your class interests and of the future of humanity. You are not 'outlaws' the way the capitalists' world brands revolutionary fighters. You are fighting for a higher morality and the law of the social revolution.

"Having crushed the capitalist state and the social revolution, acting through armed workers and soldiers, will establish the soviet state as the instrument of the workers' and poor farmers' power.

"The Government of the soviets is a government of those who work. It is elected in the places of work from among those who work, and it is responsible to those who elected it. It consists exclusively of workers and peasants, which means that it is the greatest democracy in the world. It is a real government of the rank and file. Exploiters are barred from it. Its deputies and other officials are paid no more than the average wage of a skilled worker. Its deputies are subject to instant recall by their electors. Under the soviets the workers and peasants are armed, and police and judicial functions are carried out by the workers and peasants themselves.

"This government has the great task of taking away from the owners the plants, factories, railroads, banks, and turning them into public property to be administered by the workers for the common benefit of all. In other words, it is the task of the soviets to abolish private property in the means of production and to establish socialist production and distribution.

"This cannot be accomplished peacefully. The exploiters won't give up their loot even after their state power is crushed. They will have to be routed. The soviet state will organize and will have to crush these with an iron hand. The former exploiters will be given no quarter. The old system of robbery with all its rubbish will have to be cleared away. This means that the soviet state must be ruthless; it must destroy the counterrevolutionary forces, the quicker the better for the workers and for the future of mankind. This is why the soviet state is named dictatorship of the proletariat. It is the reverse of capitalist dictatorship. It does not pretend to be a government treating all on the basis of equality. It openly declares itself to be a class government directed against the former ruling class. It is avowedly an instrument for the expression and the suppression of the former ruling class, the exploiters and oppressors. It is the government of the former exploited and oppressed. And it does away with the exploitation and oppression forever. As soon as private property is abolished, as soon as industrial machinery of the country has become socialized, as soon as the individual machinery farmers have been induced, for their own advantage, to unite in collective farms, exploitation of man by man ceases to exist. That means freedom."

We again quote from the Statutes, Theses, and Conditions of Admission to the Communist International, heretofore introduced as exhibit 3.

"The Third Communist International, which was established in March 1919, in the capital of the Russian Socialist Federated Republic, solemnly proclaims before the entire world that it takes upon itself to continue and complete the great cause begun by the First International Workers Association. The Communist International makes its aim to put up an armed struggle for the overthrow of the international bourgeois, and to create an international soviet republic.

"The new International Association of Workers is established for the purpose of organizing common activity of the workers of various countries, who are striving toward a single aim—the overthrow of capitalism; the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat; and of International Soviet Republic; the first

step of Communist society. The new International Association of Workers has been given the name of the Communist International."

We now introduce the pamphlet entitled "Elements of Political Education," by A. Bordnikov and S. Svatlov, which was purchased in an official Communist bookstore located at 226½ South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif., and was admitted by the clerk to be an official document of the Communist Party of the U. S. We request that it be accepted and marked as "Exhibit 21." We quote therefrom as follows:

"In what way can the proletariat free itself from the yoke of capitalism? Only through violent, armed methods—through civil war, revolution and dictatorship—while organized in special political party (the Communist Party).

"Why cannot capitalism be abolished by peaceful methods without armed struggle and violence?

"Because the class oppositions and the class struggle are irreconcilable, and the result of the class struggle can be decided for the proletariat, in the last analysis, only by force of arms. The bourgeoisie is armed and acts with all its wealth and the whole power of its state and other apparatus, and the proletariat can oppose all this only with its numbers, its productive power, organization, and with arms in its hands.

"Civil war is the highest stage of the class struggle, when one class enters into open battle with the other classes, with the aim of seizing or maintaining political power in its hands."

We again call your attention to Why Communism, by M. J. Oglin, heretofore introduced as Exhibit 4.

Page 77: "It has been done more than once." "A workers' revolution was accomplished in Russia in November 1917." "A workers' revolution took place in Germany in 1918, in Hungary and Bavaria in 1919, in China in 1927, in Spain in 1932." "In Russia the revolution has survived first of all because the workers had a strong, well-organized Bolshevik (Communist) Party that headed their fight. The defeat of the other revolutions does not argue against the eventuality of revolution. In fact, revolutions are inevitable."

Pages 82-83: "The soviet will have to expropriate the expropriators by force." "The soviet state will have to crush these with an iron hand. The former exploiters will be given no quarter." "This means that the soviet state must be ruthless; it must destroy the counterrevolutionary forces—the quicker the better for the workers and for the future of mankind. This is why the soviet state is named dictatorship of the proletariat." "It uses force and violence against that class." "And it does away with exploitation and oppression forever. This is communism."

We here desire to introduce the following pamphlet, entitled "Fifteen Years of the Communist International," which was purchased in an official Communist bookstore located at 226½ South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif., and was admitted by the clerk to be an official document of the Communist Party of the U. S. A. We request that it be accepted and marked as "Exhibit 22."

Page 3: "Fifteen years ago, on March 4, 1919, in 'red' Moscow, the first congress, under Lenin's leadership, established the Communist International—the new International Workingmen's Association."

Page 9: "The Communist International openly declares that the dictatorship of the proletariat can be accomplished only by means of violence * * * the violence of the bourgeoisie can only be suppressed by the stern violence of the proletariat."

Page 10: "The 15 years of the Communist International have been 15 years of uneven but constant development of the world proletarian revolution."

Page 11: "Having assumed power as a result of the workers' uprising, the German Social-Democratic Party betrayed the proletarian revolution."

Page 12: "The path of October, the path of the dictatorship of the proletarian, brought the Soviet Union to socialism. The path of bourgeois democracy brought Germany to fascism."

Page 15: "A mighty wave of the proletarian revolution led to the formation of the Hungarian Soviet Republic on March 21, 1919. Under the leadership of Communists the Hungarian soviets disarmed the gendarmerie and the police, organized a "red army" * * *. After existing about four and a half months, the Hungarian Soviet Republic was betrayed by Hungarian social-democracy and drowned in blood by the international counterrevolution. Not 'democracy' but fascism took the place of the soviets. 'No Communist should forget the lessons of the Hungarian Soviet Republic.'"

Pages 15-16: "The Bavarian Soviet Republic, which arose on April 13, 1919, under Communist leadership, disarmed the bourgeoisie, armed the proletariat, proclaimed the nationalization of industry and the banks. But it, too, was crushed by the White Guards, with the active cooperation of German social-democracy, after having existed 18 days."

Page 19: "The Leninist national policy of the Communist International is an irreplaceable weapon in the struggle against fascism."

Page 20: "In Italy, too, the victory of the bourgeoisie, which was made certain by the social-democrats, ended not in a strengthened 'democracy' but in the triumph of fascism."

Page 22: "* * * the slogan 'To the masses,' was that this slogan was a program of struggle for all the sections of the Comintern for an entire historical period, a program of preparation for the second round of revolutions and wars."

Page 37: "The Communist parties have thousands and tens of thousands of members each; their influence extends over hundreds of thousands and millions of workers and peasants; they have already scored their first successes in establishing the united front. There is not a single Communist party whose influence has not grown among the masses since the beginning of the economic crisis. The Communists are the only leaders of the masses, the motor of every revolutionary struggle, and they are the first to receive the blows of the class enemy. Most of the Communist parties have gained the necessary prerequisites for becoming real mass fighting parties of the proletariat in the near future."

Page 39: "The task of winning over the majority of the working class demands the transformation of the factory committees of the trade-union oppositions, of the committees of unemployed, of the peasant committees, and especially the transformation of the big enterprises, into strongholds of the Communist parties."

And, finally, we introduce the pamphlet entitled "The Struggle Against Imperialist War and the Tasks of the Communists," which was purchased in an official Communist bookstore located at 226½ South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif., and was admitted by the clerk to be an official document of the Communist Party of the U. S. A. We request that it be accepted and marked as "Exhibit 23" and quote therefrom as follows:

Page 5: "The persecution and measures of suppression against the Communist parties are being systematically intensified and the Comintern sections in all imperialist countries are immediately confronted with the danger of being driven 'underground,' into complete illegality."

Page 9: "War is inseparable from capitalism. From this it follows that the 'abolition' of war is possible only through the 'abolition' of capitalism, i. e., through the overthrow of the bourgeois class of exploiters, through the proletarian dictatorship, the building of socialism, and the elimination of classes."

Page 10: "But the overthrow of capitalism is impossible without force, without armed uprising, and proletarian wars against the bourgeoisie."

ILLEGALITY

Your especial attention is called to the quotation from The Struggle Against Imperialist War and the Tasks of the Communists, on page 5 thereof, where the Communist Party recognizes the possibility of being driven underground or into illegality. The theory of Communist International is that as the struggle waxes sharper and the attempts of the Government to put down uprisings is intensified, the party must still carry on its operations by withholding from the scene as in this instance, the Communist Party of the U. S. A., and become something else to the people, but actually carry on its task through force and violence as an illegally existing party. The technique of accomplishing this was demonstrated in Germany in the Communist struggle for power against the Nazis. Its program for so doing in the U. S. A. has been discovered only in part, because in the U. S. A. the party is attempting to carry on its class struggle through the medium of the general strike. Two attempts have already been made to start a national general strike, the first being in 1934, at the time of the maritime strike in San Francisco, and the second in April 1937, at the time of the sit-down strikes in the steel, automotive, and rubber industries. Herein the development of the technique of force and violence was carried on in the trade-unions under party fraction control. For the evidence of this, you are referred to the succeeding sections of this brief entitled "The General Strike" and "Trade-Unions." Out of their own mouths have the

Communists convicted themselves, but that there may no doubt as to the present attitude of the Communist Party, U. S. A. Section, Communist International, toward force and violence, we quote from the present secretary of that party, Mr. Earl Browder, as follows: "The property rights of the capitalists and the institutions by which they are maintained must be abolished. Thus some form of violence is unavoidable. There is no possible choice between violence and nonviolence."

In answer to our charge that at the present time the Communist Party, U. S. A. Section, Communist International advocates the use of force and violence may be raised the point that since the Seventh Congress of Communist International a new strategy has been developed by the party; that the setting up of popular or people's front for peace and democracy indicates that the party will no longer use violence. We know it to be true that at the coming convention of the Communist Party of the U. S. A. there will be introduced resolutions whereby the party members are called upon to give allegiance to the U. S. A., to show respect to the flag of the United States, and to sing the Star-Spangled Banner. This is mere subterfuge. The Communist International has not changed, and to prove this we introduce at this time its official publication entitled "The Communist International" of March 1938, with the request that it be entered and marked "Exhibit 24." We call the attention of the committee to a letter from Comrade Ivanov and Comrade Stalin's reply found on pages 222-226 of this volume, in which Comrade Ivanov asks: "Dear Comrade Stalin: * * * Will you explain whether or not we have yet the final victory of socialism * * *?" And then Comrade Stalin replies: "To Comrade Ivan Philipovich Ivanov * * *. The second side of the question of the victory of socialism in our country * * * concerns the sphere of external international relations * * * thus it follows that the second problem is not yet solved and that it has yet to be solved. * * * The international proletariat ties between the working class of the U. S. S. R. and the working class in bourgeoisie countries must be increased; the political assistance of the working class in the bourgeoisie countries for the working class in our country must be organized in the event of a military attack on our country; and also every assistance of the working class of our country for the working class in bourgeoisie countries must be recognized; our Red Army, Red Navy, Red Airfleets and the Chemical and Air Defense Society must be increased and strengthened to the utmost."

The Communist Party's national convention held in New York in June of 1938 did precisely as we predicted it would on page 97 of this brief.

It adopted a new constitution containing mere platitudes regarding its allegiance to the United States of America.

A careful analysis of this new constitution, however, shows that it declares its allegiance only to such general principles of the Constitution as it chooses and not to the Constitution as a document in toto.

It does not declare that it will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against its enemies whomsoever. It merely declares that it will uphold such democratic statements as may be found and approved by the Communist Party.

The fiction carried on by the party that it has changed from its principle objective, namely, the overthrow of this Government by force and violence for the creation of a soviet state is easily disproved.

We desire to call the committee's attention to the statement made by Comrade Stalin in his letter to Ivan Ivanov, quoted heretofore on page 97 of this brief.

We further offer as a test of the sincerity of purpose of the party the following:

1. The Communist Party of the United States of America has not indicated in any manner that it has severed relationships with the Communist International.

2. The Communist International, as the committee has seen in the chapter on that subject, states that one of the conditions of membership in Communist International is that strict adherence to its decisions must be given. It has been proven that Communist International advocates the overthrow of capitalist states by violence. The Communist Party of the United States is put in the position that it must either adhere to this principle or withdraw from Communist International.

3. If we assume, as they state as a matter of fact in their constitution, that they are affiliated with Communist International, then all the acts of the convention of June 1938 are yet to be ratified by the executive committee of

Communist International or the next congress of Communist International whenever it may be held.

4. It is pointed out that a Communist international congress or the executive committee of Communist International may not, in order to carry out the subterfuge, render an affirmation or denial to the action taken by the 1938 convention.

5. The actions of the convention of June 1938 place Communist International Presidium, the executive committee of the Communist International, and any future congress of Communist International in the positive position that they will have to expel the United States section of the Communist Party from Communist International or ratify what it has done and thereby change the whole policy of Communist International.

Until such time as this is done it is respectfully submitted to the committee that no other position can be taken by the United States Government than the assumption that no real change has been made in the structure, aims, and objectives of the Communist Party of the United States of America or its mandatory relationship with Communist International.

As further indicative of the absolute authority of the Communist International over the Communist Party of the United States of America regardless of feeble protestations to the contrary we submit as Exhibit No. 24-B, attached clipping of the New York Times, issue of June 30, 1938, relative to a hearing held before a joint legislative committee of the State of Massachusetts, at which Earl C. Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States of America, was questioned with regard to the affiliation of the national party with the international party. Senator McNaboe, in producing a copy of the constitution of the Communist International, questioned Browder as follows:

"This says you are required to 'abide' by any decisions of the Communist International," the Senator said.

"The decision is binding here only when the Communist Party of the United States has acted upon it," said Mr. Browder.

"Do you mean to tell us you may veto a decision of the International?"

"That is correct."

"Have you ever vetoed one?"

"Everything we ever had to pass upon," replied Mr. Browder, "we agreed with."

It is, of course, plain to a child that any disagreement with the Communist International would be promptly and severely punished, and the mere fact that the Communist Party of the United States of America has never disagreed with the Communist International is highly significant.

The Communist Party has also, in anticipation of the adoption of the new constitution for the party, caused certain changes to be made in the issue of its organ on the Pacific coast, *The Western Worker*.

This change was carried out by dropping from the banner of the paper the statement "Section of Communist International" and also the hammer and sickle. It has also changed the name from *The Western Worker* to that of *The Peoples' World*.

We desire at this time to introduce as evidence a document known as "application for membership in the Communist Party," said document being issued at a mass meeting held in honor of Earl Browder and Mr. Foster in San Francisco on August 25, 1938, and request that it be marked Exhibit No. 24-A.

The attention of the committee is called to the fact that on the reverse side of the application for membership is an application for subscription to the paper *The Peoples' World*.

This proves that *The Peoples' World* is merely an extension of the old *Western Worker* as the official organ of the Communist Party.

VII. THE GENERAL STRIKE

It is self evident that if the classless society of Communists is made up of the working people that its greatest recruiting is to come from labor groups. It is therefore necessary for us to study the technique of operation of Communist International and the Communist Party of the U. S. A. within the trade unions.

We desire at this time to introduce the following exhibits, and request that they be marked as indicated:

Exhibit 25, "Communist Policy on the Trade Union Question."

Exhibit 26, "Reprint from San Diego Labor Leader, Jan. 1936."

Exhibit 27, "Industrial Unionism," by William Z. Foster.

Exhibit 32, "Attempt by Communists to Seize the American Labor Movement."

Exhibit 33, Clippings "The American Citizen" entitled "Official Red Comments."

Exhibit 34, "Party Organizer," July 1935.

Exhibit 35, "Unionizing Steel," by William Z. Foster.

Exhibit 36, "The Great Sirdown Strike," by Wm. Weinstone.

Exhibit 37, "How the Rubber Workers Won," C. I. O. Pamphlet.

Exhibit 38, "Special Bulletin C-20," by Industrial Association of San Francisco.

Exhibit 39, "Our Trade Union Policy," by the Editorial Commission, Washington State Communist Party.

Exhibit 40, "Control of State Federation Convention"—Communist Bulletin.

Subtle infiltration of Communists, and before them of Socialists, into the ranks of organized labor, the spreading of revolutionary propaganda, and the undermining of the American Federation of Labor in the "struggle" for the building of a rival labor organization under direct Communist control, such as we have in the C. I. O. today, began long ago.

The Knights of Labor, the Populist Party, the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance, and the Industrial Workers of the World were natural forbears of "the new labor movement," which with the coming of communism shortly after the World War, was developed into the Trade Union Unity League and finally into the Committee for Industrial Organization.

Whereas the early revolts against the American Federation of Labor were promoted either by self-seeking labor leaders, political demagogues, or selfish employer interests, the I. W. W. movement, which had its foundation in the organization of the radical Western Federation of Miners back in 1905, and which in 1922 and 1923 all but wrecked the A. F. of L. with its disastrous "rank and file" movement, was distinctly of Socialist and anarchist origin and aims.

Following the collapse of the I. W. W., William Z. Foster, leader in that movement, formed the Trade Union Unity League, with the avowed purpose of "boring from within" and capturing the A. F. of L. unions and transforming them into instruments of the "social revolution." This work was unsuccessful until after the Russian revolution and the foundation of the Third International, whose avowed purpose was the promoting of world revolution, by violence if necessary. Foster immediately attached himself to and became a leader in the Communist movement in America, representing the Communist Party, U. S. A., in the sixth and subsequent world congresses of the Communist International.

The Trade Union Unity League was amalgamated, under Foster's guidance, with the Communist Party, and took charge of its trade-union work. Dual unions were formed where the T. U. U. L. was unable to capture existing unions. Communists succeeded in capturing completely the Fur Workers, the International Ladies Garment Workers, and several others, but found that only a few of the national unions could be controlled by the "reds," and T. U. U. L. sought to organize competing unions in many industries. The National Miners' Union, forerunner of the Progressive Miners' Union, agricultural workers unions, and a few others, were established. None sought to improve workers' wages or conditions—all were stepping stones to "social revolution."

In January 1935 the central committee plenum of the Communist Party, meeting in New York, adopted new tactics. The T. U. U. L. was ordered abandoned and all dual unions ordered dissolved. Resolutions were adopted, declaring (exhibit 25):

"The influx of hundreds of thousands of new workers from the basic industries and mass production plants into the A. F. of L. unions, and the growing radicalization of the main mass unions in character, open up new and greater possibilities of revolutionary mass work within them." * * * "The main task of the party in the sphere of trade-union work should be the work in the A. F. of L. unions so as energetically and tirelessly to mobilize the masses of their members and the trade-unions as a whole for the defense of the everyday interests of the workers, the leadership of strikes, carrying out the policy of the class struggle in the trade-unions * * *. Communists and other advanced workers must develop a wide strike movement, fighting on the basis of trade-union democracy for the leadership of the struggle * * *."

The orders issued by the plenum directed that "existing revolutionary trade unions (sponsored by the T. U. U. L.) and their locals join the A. F. of L. and its unions wherever there exist parallel mass A. F. of L. trade unions, or the

"red" trade unions can join the A. F. of L. directly. The revolutionary unions and their branches should attempt to join the A. F. of L. unions as organized units, not weakening their mass work, but, on the contrary, utilizing their entrance into the A. F. of L. as means of more widely mobilizing the working masses around the revolutionary leadership, organizing and distributing their forces so as to have the possibility of exercising a maximum amount of influence on the work of the A. F. of L. unions. In those cases where collective joining is not possible, members of the "red" unions should join the unions of the A. F. of L. individually * * *. Only those revolutionary unions whose entrance into the A. F. of L. at the present time is impossible to practice, will temporarily continue to exist independently, extending their mass basis, energetically recruiting new members.

"In view of the changing conditions of trade-union work, which demand that the center of the work be transferred to the A. F. of L., it is now inadvisable to put the question of forming an Independent Federation of Labor.

"The tone used in the press with regard to the A. F. of L. must be changed, criticizing and exposing the reactionary leaders of the A. F. of L. in a manner convincing for the rank and file, but treating the A. F. of L. locals and unions as mass workers' organizations in which we are carrying on a struggle for winning the masses to the revolutionary struggle, drawing in all honest functionaries, fighting for our influence, for winning the trade-union posts, and being ready to take on ourselves responsibility for their work.

"* * * Without strong and well-organized fractions (in the unions), the Communist Party cannot carry out the necessary flexible tactic and carry out its revolutionary line * * *. Every day leadership on the chief questions of the work of our fractions in the trade unions, especially in respect to strike leadership, must be concentrated directly in the C. C. (Central Committee) at the center and in the appropriate party committees in the localities.

"For a correct approach to the work in the A. F. of L. it is necessary from the very outset to come out against the limitation of tasks of this work to the creation of a "minority movement," or "opposition" being limited to the most militant elements that are close to the Communists, and not striving to become a real trade union, their locals, various elective posts in the trade-union organs, etc. In order to be a leading force for all the discontented workers who are swinging to the left, in order to be a mass force, the Communists * * * strengthening their class positions in the A. F. of L. and in all the trade unions, increasing the offensive on the bureaucracy, must work like real trade unionists * * * fighting for every elective post in the trade unions * * * actively participating in the training of new cadres of revolutionary unionists.

(See Exhibit 26.)

It is perhaps appropriate that Detroit and Michigan should be selected as the battleground for the first major engagement in the current drive for "industrial unionism" and against the craft union policy of the American Federation of Labor, for it was the Detroit "comrades" who are credited with having been responsible for the formation of the Communist Party in the United States. Under their leadership the Michigan delegation to the Socialist Party Convention in Chicago in 1919 broke away and, together with the Slavic Federation, organized the Communist Party.

That the Michigan strikes should be employed to commemorate their contribution to the cause of world revolution seems quite fitting, for in the program which they drew up in 1919 the plan to penetrate the A. F. of L. and to organize American workers on the basis of industrial unionism was first set forth.

"As against the trade unionism of the American Federation of Labor," that program declared, "the Communist Party propagandizes industrial unionism and industrial union organizations, emphasizing their revolutionary implications. Industrial unionism is not simply a means for the everyday struggle against capitalism; its ultimate purpose is revolutionary, implying the necessity of ending the capitalist parliamentary state. Industrial unionism is a factor in the final mass action for the conquest of power, as it will constitute the basis for the industrial administration of the Communist commonwealth."

This was the beginning of the Communist campaign to "bore from within" the A. F. of L.: to reorganize American labor on an industrial union basis; to overthrow the government by revolution; and to set up a Communist commonwealth—or as they currently phrase it—a soviet America.

During the following 3 years Communist efforts to secure a foothold in the A. F. of L. met with considerable success. In fact, so successful it was that, in

self defense, the unions were forced to take extraordinary measures to purge themselves of the destructive Communist influence. Literally thousands of "red" propagandists were expelled from the unions in 1923 and 1924. Then followed a few lean years during which the "red" elements were practically at a standstill insofar as results were concerned. They carried on plenty of agitation outside the unions, but with the exception of the Passaic strike of 1926 and a few less important needle-trades disputes, they got nowhere. America was too prosperous. The need for some new strategy was obvious.

It was the activities of John Brophy, Pat Toohey, and Powers Hapgood among the mine workers that finally paved the way for the organization of Communist industrial unions. As the outgrowth of their "Save the Union Committee," on "orders" from Moscow, the National Miners Union, a "red" industrial union, was established in the fall of 1928. Subsequently some 50-odd "red" unions in different industries, with a membership enrollment of hundreds of thousands, were organized by William Z. Foster under the banner of the Trade Union Unity League and affiliated with the Red Internationale of Labor Unions at Moscow.

After the stock market crash the "red" unions flowered and were responsible for 90 percent of the major strikes during the depression years. Foster and his TnU also organized the unemployed, the "bonus army," and many local State, and national hunger marches, with excellent results from the agitational point of view. When, however, this movement had served its purpose, the Moscow master-minds again turned their attention to the possibilities for renewed activity within the A. F. of L.—and it was at the Central Committee Plenum of the Communist Party, January 15-18, 1935, that the notorious "boring in" manifesto was authorized and put into effect.

The "boring from within" policy was adopted and carried through enthusiastically by the Communists and since early in 1935 the infusion of unruly "red" blood has been going into the A. F. of L. And with it went the agitational urge for industrial unionism and the laying of the groundwork for the "wide strike movement" prescribed by the manifesto which today threatens the country.

In August 1935, the Congress of the Communist International, meeting in Moscow, issued orders for the reorganization of the trade unions by industries and the creation of industrial unions. In a little more than a month's time some 400,000 copies of these "orders from Moscow" were distributed by the faithful in America.

Then came the A. F. of L. convention at Atlantic City, and John L. Lewis emerged in his new character as the echo of the Comintern. With the blessing of the American Communists he became the leader of the forces for industrial unionism, and proceeded to do his utmost to advance the program laid down by the Communist Congress a few weeks before.

Lewis' resolution to commit the A. F. of L. to industrial unionism was defeated by a vote of almost 2 to 1, but before the convention was over a conference held in his hotel room decided the future plan of action, and within a month—November 1935—the formation of the Committee for Industrial Organization was announced.

Immediately the behind-the-scenes mechanism in the Communist movement went into action. The Central Agit-Prop (agitation-propaganda) Commission prepared voluminous material to bolster the drive and on every front the Communist forces rallied support to Lewis and the industrial union cause. A model speech, as an example, was sent to every party leader in the country just a few weeks after the C. I. O. was established. A few passages are illuminating:

"We here in America must follow in the footsteps of Lenin * * * We must make it clear to tens of millions of workers and farmers that the revolution in the U. S. A. is inevitable, and that only the overthrow of capitalism will secure for them a decent life of abundance. * * * Capitalism can be overthrown by the armed uprising of the people headed by the working class under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party. * * * Lenin teaches us the great, the paramount importance of the Communist Party. Lenin teaches us further that it is not sufficient to have a strong Communist Party. It is necessary to have strong labor unions capable of offering resistance to the employers and of taking the offensive * * * this can be realized only when the unions are built on the industrial basis."

Shortly after the beginning of 1936, when the break between Lewis and Green occurred, the Communist Central Committee decided to come out into the open. It issued a public statement: "The Communist Party stands firmly

on the side of those progressive forces which are fighting for industrial unionism."

A short time later a 48-page booklet by William Z. Foster, entitled "Industrial Unionism," made its appearance as the first of a series of publications on C. I. O. strategy. (See exhibit 27.)

A fertile field for the development of quasi industrial unionism could be found in the maritime unions. The point of penetration into the A. F. of L. maritime unions was first directed, on the Pacific coast, that the International Longshoremen's Association, an A. F. of L. union which was chosen primarily because it was wholly quasi industrial rather than craft union in character, and secondarily on account of the type of individual engaged in that work, whom, it was felt, would be most susceptible to the peculiar leadership which the Communists were at that time able to provide.

The transition period between the abandonment of the Trade Union Unity League movement and the formation of the Committee for Industrial Organization, that has been shown heretofore, was occupied by the campaign of infiltration; of subtle attacks against the old time leadership of the A. F. of L.; of the gradual separation of the rank and file from its leadership, and of the capture by Communists of important elective offices in the Unions.

The concentrated effort of the Communist Party on the Longshoremen's unions in California was begun just prior to the elimination of Lee J. Holman as president of the I. L. A. Union Local 38-79, on April 19, 1934. Prior to that time the party was loosely scattered throughout the State and had no real leadership.

The groundwork for their activity originated with a distribution of thousands of dodgers, pamphlets and copies of Western Worker among the longshoremen of the Pacific coast and of San Francisco in particular. All this literature carried the propaganda that the leadership of the maritime and waterfront unions had been controlled by the shipowners in the past and that a "democratic" union could only be established by differentiation between the "rank-and-file" and its leadership.

While Mr. Holman was ill with pneumonia and confined to his bed, spurious charges were brought against him and he was recalled as president of the I. L. A. 38-79, to be succeeded by one Harry Bridges, an alien. This election of Bridges to head the I. L. A. marks the beginning of the consolidation and the open operation of the Communist Party in the labor movement in the Western states.

In 1933, when the National Recovery Act went into effect, the average number of longshoremen employed in San Francisco was approximately 1,300, and the largest number employed on any one day was approximately 2,500. Of the 1,300 some 900 had practically steady employment, and most of them belonged to the Longshoremen's Association of San Francisco, an independent union. Under the N. R. A. the San Francisco association was organized as an A. F. L. union and a branch of the International Longshoremen's Association, and with the infiltration of the Communists and their sympathizers, the membership was increased until at the time of the strike on May 9, 1934, it claimed more than 4,000. Bridges had not been in command of the union two months when, as a result of a controversy over demands he made in behalf of the union upon the Waterfront Employers' Association, the I. L. A. called a strike.

The history of the Longshoremen's strike, which developed into a general strike of all the maritime unions throughout the Pacific coast and finally into the General Strike in the Bay district when practically all industry and business ceased for several days, is too long to recount or even to summarize here.

We therefore offer in evidence a statement by Thomas G. Plant, president of the Waterfront Employers' Association, to the National Longshoremen's Board on July 11, 1934, and request that it be entered and marked "Exhibit 28." We also offer in evidence a pamphlet issued by the Industrial Association of San Francisco containing a reprint of an article entitled "The San Francisco General Strike and Its Lessons" which we request be entered and marked "Exhibit 29." This latter exhibit sets forth clearly from the standpoint of the Communist Party, U. S. A. Section Communist International the Communist origin and control of the maritime and general strikes and the "Revolutionary and Political Character of the Struggle." The same pamphlet reproduces another article from the same issue of the "Communist International" on "Notes on the Strike Wave in the U. S.," showing that the Pacific coast maritime strike and the San Francisco general strike were staged simply as a part of the "general strike movement" and as a preliminary "practice in revolt."

The technique of development first of the strike condition in order to bring about a general strike is clearly indicated in the Communist official pamphlet entitled "Problems of Strike Strategy" which we now introduce and request that it be entered and marked as "Exhibit 30" from which we quote as follows:

Page 5: "The problem of building the revolutionary unions of the T. U. U. L.—the American section of the Red International of Labor Unions—as well as the problem of building a mass Communist Party in the United States is largely a question of a correct strike strategy. With this is bound up the problem of destroying the reformist illusions of the American Federation of Labor and the social Facists of its left wing whose program is that of the Socialist Party.

"Both of these problems are inseparable from the main problem of winning the majority of the decisive sections of the working class for communism. Seen from this standpoint the importance of the question of working out and applying a correct strike strategy is brought clearly into the foreground—for our party, for the revolutionary trade unions and for the whole class."

Page 8: "The American working class will reap a rich harvest from the study of this pamphlet and in turn, by applying the lessons herein contained, will be able to add to its growing sum of achievements in the United States and give revolutionary proletarian aid to the millions of workers and colonial peoples who are marching forward under the revolutionary banners of that Communist International and the Red International of Labor Unions."

Pages 18-19: "In order that the workers shall not be taken unawares, the trade-union opposition and the independent revolutionary unions must carry on their work in the following manner:

"It is the duty of every revolutionary union and the trade-union opposition (left wing) in every industry to organize the workers for future conflicts and struggles.

"At the first appearance of symptoms of growing dissatisfaction on the part of the workers, or aggressive intentions on the part of the employers, in a given industry, the question of an approaching conflict must be brought sharply before the masses.

"Preparatory agitational and organizational work must be carried on under the following slogans: 'Do not rely on the trade-union bureaucrats!' 'Prepare, for the struggle, otherwise you will be defeated.' in this agitational work all concrete cases of treachery by the trade-union bureaucracy in recent economic struggles must be utilized.

"It is necessary during this preparatory period, through personal conversation and pressure at meetings to single out those elements among the nonparty, reformist, anarchosyndicalist, or Catholic workers who may be drawn into the struggle against the employers on the bases of our independent tactics, i. e., not dependent on the trade-union bureaucracy, and to participate together with the revolutionary workers in our independent instruments of struggle (shop committees, strike committees, committees of action, etc.—Ed.)."

Pages 19-20: "The revolutionary trade-unions and the trade-union opposition must carefully examine and constantly check up on the work of all its instruments, from the viewpoint of contact with the mass workers in the various factories. Especially must all signs of red tape or bureaucracy hindering them from reacting quickly to any development among the workers be combated.

"The revolutionary trade-unions and the trade-union opposition must carry on all of its preparatory work in such a manner that the need for creating militant instruments to lead the struggle should emanate from the rank-and-file workers. This question should become the subject of discussion in all factories and shops.

"At the approach of a lockout, it is necessary to issue slogans for the creation of militant committees of struggle against the lockout, elected in the factory by all the workers, regardless of their party and trade-union affiliations, organized or unorganized.

"In case of favorable conditions for a strike, and with a militant mood prevailing among the masses, the creation of strike committees (this also holds true in those cases where the strike is led by revolutionary trade-unions) elected by all workers should be undertaken. Workers of all beliefs and affiliation must participate in these elections, the organized, as well as the unorganized.

"At the same time, the sharpest agitation and propaganda must be carried on among the masses against the appointment of strike committees from the top (i. e., by the bureaucrats—Trans.) and against efforts of the trade-union bureaucrats to transfer the leadership in these conflicts to such committees.

"Preparation of the working masses for the struggle must be carried on not orally, but also in the press. In this regard the trade-union and party press is taxed with a serious duty. It is necessary to issue special leaflets, special supplements of the press, shop papers, etc., dealing with the approaching conflict."

Page 25: "Simultaneously with the withdrawal of the revolutionary minorities from a strike committee which has fallen under the influence of the reformist, the minority must appeal to the mass of workers and organize the election of a new strike committee in order to continue the struggle."

Page 28: "No official representation of reformist trade-unions should be permitted on the strike committee which has fallen under the influence of the reformists, the minority must appeal to the mass of workers and organize the election of a new strike committee in order to continue the struggle."

"No official representation of reformist trade-unions should be permitted on the strike committees. The adherents of the Profintern must counteract all the efforts of the representatives of the reformist trade-unions to penetrate into the strike committee by putting forth the slogan that all members of the strike committee must be elected by all the workers, organized and unorganized as well."

Page 29: "The best and most militant workers of all beliefs—Communists, social-democrats, Catholics, unorganized, etc.—must be included in all bodies which are elected."

"It is necessary to allow nonparty and reformist workers to carry various functions within the strike committee in order that they may be drawn into the immediate struggle."

Pages 29-30: "It is particularly helpful during the strikes and lockouts to convene special bread conferences of organized and unorganized workers (men, women, and young workers), in order to pick out and place the best and most energetic of them in posts of militant leadership."

Page 31: "Absolutely all workers, no matter what their beliefs, and affiliations, must be drawn into the picket line, in such a manner as to have the experienced, militant comrades working together with the unorganized workers, the social-democrats, Catholics, etc."

"The leading pickets should be carefully chosen, utilizing not only the young workers, but also the older workers, men and women, and especially workers' wives."

"Special demonstrations of strikers' wives and children against the strike-breakers and the police force defending the strikebreakers, is very effective."

Page 32: "Especial attention should be given to the fight against various police and private detective organizations (factory militia, detectives, shop spies, stool pigeons, fire brigades which are part of the police force, etc.)."

Pages 41-42: "Because of the concentration of capital and the practice of the bourgeoisie and reformists to replace strikers by obligatory arbitration, every strike acquires political character. This does not mean that all the workers understand the political, i. e., the general class significance of the current economic struggles. In this situation, it is the task of the adherents of the Profintern to teach the masses politics on the basis of every-day struggle. This means it is necessary to issue slogans at each stage of the struggle, on the basis of the demands, which will raise the fight to a higher level."

Finally to emphasize that all Communist endeavor within the trade-unions is to lead up through a course of force and violence to the general strike, and through the general strike to armed insurrection, we quote again from the Program of the Communist International heretofore introduced and marked "Exhibit 10," as follows: "When the revolutionary tide is rising, when the ruling classes are disorganized, * * * we are confronted with the task of leading the masses to a direct attack upon the bourgeoisie state. This is done by carrying on propaganda * * * and armed demonstrations, and finally, the general strike with armed insurrection * * * the latter form of struggle must be conducted according to rules of war." Having thus given the objective and plan of the Communist Party U. S. A. Section Communist International for the development and conduct of the general strike, we now quote from the article The San Francisco General Strike and Its Lessons heretofore introduced and marked "Exhibit 29."

"The general strike in San Francisco and surrounding cities, and the Pacific coast maritime workers struggle which led up to it took place in the midst of the second big wave of strike struggles sweeping the United States and continually rising in the level of militancy and displaying an ever more clearly defined political power and character."

"The sympathy of the workers for the strikers expressed itself in the rapidly spreading sentiment for a general strike. Forty thousand workers attended the funeral of the two pickets killed, one of whom was a member of the Communist Party.

"Only in San Francisco, however, did the general strike materialize because precisely in San Francisco the leadership of the maritime strike was firmly in the hands of the militant rank and file strongly influenced by the party, and the whole strike assumed the character of a united front struggle against the employers and the government.

"The reason for our strength in San Francisco, as distinguished from other strike situations where the party stood on the outside of the struggle is that already in the middle of 1933, when the majority of the longshoremen showed their desire to belong to the A. F. L. the Communists actively participated in the organization for the longshoremen into the A. F. L. local union. The A. F. L. district and national officials of the I. L. A. worked day and night to prevent the strike from taking place and, after it broke out, to send the men back to work, but their every move was defeated by the local strike leadership which represented the sentiments of the rank and file.

"The policy of the party was to spread the strike, not only to all branches of the marine industry on the Pacific coast, but to the Atlantic and southern ports. However, our extremely weak position in the A. F. L. unions in those other ports made it impossible to spread the strike into a national strike of longshoremen and seamen. Only in a few instances was the Marine Workers Industrial Union able to call strikes of seamen on a few ships.

"In the face of the unyielding position of the employers, the question of developing a movement for a general strike in Pacific coast ports in support of the maritime strikers, became so great that the San Francisco strike committee decided to make the Western Worker (the Communist Party weekly organ of the Pacific coast) their official strike organ.

"The general strike began on July 16 in San Francisco, spreading on the following day to the other nearby cities, Oakland, Berkeley, and Alameda.

"With the exception of San Francisco to a lesser extent other Pacific coast ports, and also Milwaukee where the party has shown good leadership we have remained outside of many important strike struggles in the present big strike wave and did not directly influence the leadership of these strikes.

"The party, although functioning well under conditions of the terror issuing the Western Worker and leaflets to the troops illegally, and the leadership functioning intact in spite of the raids, underestimated the extent of the terror and was not prepared for it.

"The San Francisco general strike and the movements for local general strikes in other centers throughout the country, bear eloquent testimony to the correctness of the estimation given by the thirteenth plenum of the E. C. C. I. (executive committee Communist International), and particularly of the point indicating the inevitability of economic strikes more and more, interweaving with the mass political strike. The historic significance of the San Francisco general strike will leave its imprint on the future development of still greater class battles during the approaching second round of revolution and wars. The party must see to it that these lessons are made the property of the whole working class.

"What is the secret of the defeat of the general strike movement in the other cities and the success of the general strike movement in San Francisco? The secret lies in the success of the general strike movement in San Francisco—of the leadership of the party in the strike of the longshoremen and in the ability of the party to defeat in the moves which the top leaders of the A. F. L. made to prevent the outbreak of the general strike. We can unhesitatingly state that without the leadership of the party the general strike in San Francisco would not have materialized.

"What would be the best method of absorbing the positive lessons of the strikes in San Francisco? The best method, we believe, would be to contrast the positive lessons of San Francisco with our failures in the other important local general strike movements. The splendid leadership of the San Francisco party organization in the development of the general strike (though note must be taken of the serious errors of unity at any price, of legalistic tendencies) can serve as good examples for the role of the district leadership in the present wave of strike struggles.

"It is therefore our absence as an inside force which explains why the strike remained in the hands of the leadership of the A. F. L. despite the unexampled

heroism of the Toledo strikers and the sweeping movement for the local general strike (close to 90 locals of the A. F. L. voted for the local general strike in support of the Toledo auto parts workers.)

"The General Strike in San Francisco broke out in support of the striking longshoremen belonging to the International Longshoremen's Association, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. All during the strike of the San Francisco longshoremen, which began May 9, we were inside the union working amongst the workers. Indeed, it was a daily combat between the forces inside the union under the influence of the party and strikebreaking leaders of the A. F. L. Our presence within the A. F. L. resulted in the establishment of a rank-and-file strike committee which took the strike out of the hands of the top leaders of the A. F. L.

"The most important fact, namely, that last year when the movement for organization took place amongst the San Francisco longshoremen, this movement for organization took place throughout the American Federation of Labor. We did not isolate ourselves from this movement. We participated in the building of the San Francisco local of the I. L. A. affiliated to the A. F. L. It is this fact which establishes us as the inside force within the A. F. L. union. It is this fact that enabled us to become a deciding influence in the calling of the longshoremen's strike and establishing our influence and leadership amongst the striking longshoremen.

"The outbreak of the general strike in San Francisco can really be traced back to our participating with the workers in the building of the A. F. of L. union local for the I. L. A. This fact cannot be overestimated.

"It is the militant leadership of the longshoremen's strike which aroused and inspired the desire for victory on the part of all the port workers of San Francisco. It is this spirit which led to the outbreak of the general strike. Thus we see that concentration and the winning of leadership in one strategic point as the longshoremen's strike, can indeed become the starting point for such a sweeping movement as the general strike in San Francisco was.

"Here we may contrast again with the San Francisco situation. Had we in the steel industry succeeded, either through our work within the A. A. or through the establishment of the Steel and Metal Workers Industrial Union as a mass local in a strategic steel mill, we could have called out a local steel strike which would have worked against the strikebreaking methods and leadership of Green and Tighe.

"The result was that despite the strong urge for strike struggle displayed on the part of the auto workers, no strike in an auto plant took place which could have become the signal for the development of the auto strike despite Green and Collins. Here again the contrast between the developments of the San Francisco strike situation and the threatened auto general strike is quite obvious.

"We have continually addressed united front appeals for the building of one union in the industry. Our appeals were received by the workers sympathetically in many instances, but they had no effect insofar as the actual organization and leadership in the strike struggles were concerned. The reason for this is that we remained outside of the unions in which the workers were organized, namely, the A. F. of L. unions. Would not our position in the auto industry be much stronger if we would call upon our followers in such plants where the Auto Workers Union has no mass basis, to join and participate in the life and activities of the federal locals of the A. F. of L. (without liquidating the Auto Workers Union in such plants where it is stronger than the federal locals)?

"If we compare the Toledo strike, the Minneapolis, and other strikes with the San Francisco strike, we see that in San Francisco we were successful mainly because we participated in the foundation of the local unions to which the workers showed an urge to belong, i. e., to the A. F. of L., thus enabling us to be inside and with the workers, while, in the other strike situation, we remained aloof and isolated from the main trend of the workers, which was toward the A. F. of L.

"The present strike struggles offer the most favorable opportunities for placing ourselves at the head of the strike movement. This can be accomplished, provided we put the main emphasis on the militant leadership of, and participation in, strike struggles through activities inside the A. F. of L. unions of San Francisco and among the strikers following reformist leadership. The lessons of San Francisco are that, by putting the main emphasis on work within the A. F. of L. and that at the same time skillfully organizing the militant actions of the 'red' union, even though the union is in a weak position, and

developing the united front activities in the steel mills led by the S. M. W. I. U., have shown that the party is learning in practice how to become the mass leader of the American proletariat. To the extent that we absorb the positive lessons of the general strike in San Francisco, to the extent that we learn from our basic mistakes in the other strike situations, to the extent we will become the deciding factor in the present strike wave in the United States that we can really take the step which will help us put an end to our isolation from the basic sections of the American proletariat.

"The unions.

"At first, however, we call your attention to the very outlook of many of those leaders, to what is called in scientific language their ideology. They proceed from the conception of unity of interests between the employer and the employee. By this alone they deceive the worker. There is no more unity between the employer and the employee than there is between the robber and the robbed. There is a clash of interests. There is an eternal antagonism. There can be no peace and no unity between the exploiter and his victims. The capitalist strives to secure for himself as much of the workers' product as he can, get as big a share of their own product as they can force the boss to yield. That is fundamental. That is the law of capitalist society. It is the division of classes. It is the never-ending class conflict as long as capitalism lasts. This conflict may not always break out in mass action, like demonstrations and strikes, but it always smolders underneath. Capitalist society is a battleground and the workers are an army on the march against the enemy.

"We Communists look upon the labor union as upon the front trench organization of the working class. It is this organization through which the workers directly confront the employers in the struggle for better conditions. The union cannot do away with exploitations, for exploitation will disappear only with capitalism itself. But the union can improve the conditions of the workers—to a degree. The union is the organization of the workers at the very source of exploitation. Its place is in the shop facing the employer. It must be on the alert. The employer is always ready with new schemes to squeeze greater surplus value out of the workers. He is assisted by all sorts of advisers. He never lets up. He will even go as far as to assure you that your own standard of living won't be reduced if only you allow him greater profits. He will complain bitterly that your 'unreasonable' demands may force him to close his business. To meet all these machinations you need a union that is wide awake, flexible, and has great fighting power. Such a union trains the workers for the final clash with capitalism to abolish it altogether.

"It is for such a militant spirit and for such leadership that we Communists are fighting in the labor unions. And it is just for this that the reformist leaders call us 'disrupters,' 'irresponsible elements' and 'reds.'

"We understand why the reformist leaders are dead set against us. We see through them and we tell the workers the truth. Wherever we are we organize the workers; we help organize the union; we try to enlighten the workers as to their class interests. Many reformist leaders shun the word 'class.' They favor class collaboration with the employers. Therefore, they do not want the workers to look upon themselves as a class, to understand that their class prides and interests cannot be reconciled with those of the bosses. We try to develop class consciousness, class militance, class pride. They call us disrupters; but what we disrupt is the unity between some reformist leaders and the bosses. They call us irresponsible, but the responsibility we reject is the responsibility for the bosses profits. Also we have no fear of the bosses. We say that the workers can be stronger than the bosses, if only they are organized and conscious. We say that even the powerful Steel Trust can be forced to yield concessions to the workers if they organize their strength."

The above quotations out of the mouth of the Communist Party have clearly proven how that party intends to use trade-unionism in its development of class warfare and revolution. One more interesting document we shall introduce, however, at this time to show the direct tactic to be observed when the next general strike is developed in the U. S. A. and may we introduce at this time the following leaflet, put out by the strike committee immediately after the general strike of 1934, with a request that it be entered and marked "exhibit 31."

"1. A vote 'yes' on strike must be followed up with a vote to elect at least 25 rank-and-file union members on the strike committee.

"2. To make sure only those members who voted 'yes' for strike be elected on strike committee.

"3. General strike convention—elect a legal department of nine, a permit department of nine, a food department of nine, and make sure that the above committees are competent.

"4. Call out the press and the newsboys off the street.

"5. Call out the radio, telephone, telegraph.

"6. Five delegates from each strike committee to be seated in strike convention.

"7. Only the labor present to be permitted to come out.

"8. General strike time must be set by strike committee within 24 to 48 hours; mass meetings to be held all over the city to keep the members informed of latest developments.

"9. See that the leaders have a bodyguard at all times.

"10. The strike convention must be in session every day. No holidays.

"11. See that there is no settlement until all unions are dealt with.

"12. Keep the capitalist newspaper reporters away from the convention hall at all times. The newspapers helped to break the last general strike.

"13. See that the committee meetings are held at different halls and that there are no dictaphones in the meeting halls. Committee members should keep their mouths shut when on the street. * * * It is the worker versus capitalism."

Mr. KNOWLES. I think with that summation we can proceed to what the chairman has indicated as the Bridges brief.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the Bridges brief is gone into, may I clarify a few things.

The status of the *Bridges case* now is that the Department of Labor suspended deportation proceedings on the alleged ground that if the decision of the circuit court of appeals is upheld by the Supreme Court, it would make it impossible or difficult to deport Bridges. That is the ground upon which they acted, and there has been an appeal to the Supreme Court.

As throwing light upon the *Bridges case*, so that we may know more about it, first, who is Edward W. Cahill?

Mr. KNOWLES. He is the district commissioner of immigration at San Francisco.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to read a letter, dated April 21, 1938, from Edward W. Cahill to Commissioner of Immigration James L. Houghteling, before we go into the *Bridges case*. This letter reads as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
San Francisco, Calif., April 21, 1938.

HON. JAMES L. HOUGHTELING,
Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER HOUGHTELING: Your letter of the 15th, commenting on the *Harry Bridges case*, also the telegram in reference to the postponement of this case until after a decision by the Supreme Court, are before me.

You can easily realize that an avalanche of newspaper, magazine, and free-lance feature writers have been trying to get a story from me on the *Bridges case*. I had a stock statement for all: That I had no information nor any authority to give out anything on this case; that there would be a board of three appointed by the central office to come here and hear the evidence; and until such time as that board arrived, there would probably be no release for the press.

It seems that this kept all the papers in place except one, which broke out, quoting me in a statement that I did not make. I am enclosing a clipping from the San Francisco News of April 19, 1938. When you read down through the third paragraph: "Mr. Cahill said, etc." you will agree with me that anyone who had been in the Immigration Service for over 30 days would not say, "the Labor Department," when he meant "the Immigration Service," nor would he call the members of the board "the three commissioners." And, of course, under

no circumstances would I tell anyone, nor have I ever told anyone, that the final decision would be made by the Secretary of Labor. My whole purpose has been to make no definite statement and in no way pin the responsibility for the decision in this case on the Secretary. My intuition would not have to be very keen to sense, in listening to these reporters' questions, that this is exactly what those unfriendly to the Labor Department would like to do. You can imagine any annoyance, then, at the deliberate misquotation contained in the clipping enclosed. Yesterday I saw the head of the San Francisco News, as well as the editor, so I am hopeful that no News reporter will try to misquote me again.

I recall a previous letter from you, defending the average newspaper reporters, but this is one of the indefensible cases, so we shall have to ignore it. In this campaign for stopping adverse publicity, I would say that our batting average was about .900. To be brutally uncommunicative with these reporters and stop them cold would not have been good diplomacy. Practically all of the papers have been very fair, and I have thanked them personally for their cooperation.

It is very satisfying to discuss a thing like this with a man who has had your experience in the newspaper field, for I appreciate and agree with your viewpoint, and I am sure you can visualize what I have been up against out here for the last few weeks. I certainly am only too glad to cooperate on the suggestion of press releases in this case coming only from Washington.

Before we bury this case, may I just present this sequence of facts? Local broadcasting stations announced the news of the postponement of the Bridges hearing on Tuesday evening, April 19, and all San Francisco morning papers of the 20th ran the story. After 10 o'clock on the morning of the 20th, I received a telegram from Washington giving us official confirmation of the postponement.

While I am in complete agreement that such stories should be released in Washington to prevent divergence of message or discrepancy in time of release, still if there were some way that we could receive an official notice like this one as soon as we come into the office at 9 a. m. (P. S. T.), instead of receiving it after people telephone to our office about it, it would save us the embarrassment of having to say that we know nothing except what we heard over the radio or read in the newspapers, and thereby prevent one more incident which gives the public a chance to question the efficiency or sincerity of our service.

Sincerely yours,

EWC:L

(Signed) EDWARD W. CAHILL,
District Commissioner.

Likewise, before we go into that, I would like to call attention to a memorandum prepared by Mr. James L. Houghteling, to the Secretary, on the *Strecher case*, dated April 14, 1938, and particularly that paragraph which says, "If we go ahead with the hearing scheduled for the 25th instant and the Supreme Court should later affirm the action of the circuit court of appeals in the *Strecher case*, the Department might be charged with smearing Harry Bridges unnecessarily."

Now, we have your brief on the *Bridges case*.

It is a fact, is it not, that Bridges was charged not only with being a Communist alien, but also with belonging to a party that advocates force and violence?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. He was also charged with having himself advocated force and violence.

The warrant of his arrest set forth a number of grounds under the statute for his deportation.

The statute contains four clauses which provide for the deportation of aliens:

(a) Anarchists; (b) aliens opposed to or disbelieving in organized forms of government. Aliens who advise, advocate, or teach, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization, association, society, or group that advises, advocates, or teaches opposition to all

organized government; (c) aliens believing in, advising, and so forth, overthrow by force or violence of the United States Government, or all forms of law, and so forth. Aliens who believe in, advise, advocate, teach, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, or teaches: (1) The overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law, or (2) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specified individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States, or of any other organized government because of his or their official character, or (3) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property, or (4) sabotage.

Also, aliens writing, publishing, and so forth, written or printed matter, advising, and so forth, opposition to organized forms of government, overthrow by force or violence of the United States Government or all forms of law, and so forth; also, aliens, members of or affiliated with an organization, society, and so forth, writing, and so forth, written or printed matter described in the preceding paragraph. Also, on deportation:

Any alien who, at any time after entering the United States, is found to have been at the time of entry, or to have become thereafter, a member of any one of the classes of aliens enumerated in this section, shall, upon the warrant of the Secretary of Labor, be taken into custody and deported in the manner provided in this subchapter. The provisions of this section shall be applicable to the classes of aliens mentioned therein irrespective of the time of their entry into the United States.

At the proper time, I want to let the record show the warrant of arrest of Harry Bridges, with a number of grounds cited therein, and any one ground provided in the statute would have made Harry Bridges mandatorily deportable.

The warrant charges (1) that he is a member of an organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States, and so on.

On the face of the warrant, therefore, Mr. Bridges was charged by the Immigration Service with violating each one of the provisions of this mandatory statute.

The *Strecher case* only held that membership in the Communist Party, standing alone, in the absence of any proof of force or violence, either on the part of the alien or on the part of the organization with which he was affiliated, was not sufficient to justify deportation. The warrant in the *Bridges case*, with the charges made against him, as well as the evidence in the file, shows that it was an entirely different case from the *Strecher case*.

You may proceed with the *Bridges case*, and later I may want to ask some questions.

Mr. NIMMO. I think in connection with that, Mr. Chairman, it might also be emphasized, as you have already touched upon it, that the Labor Department in the *Strecher case* did not prove their case.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bonham says so; by reason of their own negligence or omission in the *Strecher case* they did not have the best evidence, and refused to proceed with the *Bridges case*. It was

due to their own omission that they did not prove what they should have proven in the *Strecher case*, and they asked for an appeal, and there is one very important thing that has not been brought out, whereby the attorney presenting the case to the Supreme Court agreed to waive one of the important grounds of deportation.

Mr. NIMMO. Mr. Chairman. I think the best procedure would be to have Mr. Knowles read first the charges by the radical research committee of the Department of California of the American Legion, and then proceed to read the brief.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLES. The radical research committee, Department of California, the American Legion, charges Alfred Renton Bridges before this committee as follows:

1. That he is guilty of violation of section 6 of the Criminal Code of the United States in that he has seditiously conspired with other parties, hereinafter to be named, to overthrow, put down and destroy by force the Government of the United States; and, by force, to prevent, hinder, and delay the execution of a law of the United States, all contrary to the authority thereof.

2. That he has been a member of the Industrial Workers of the World.

3. That he has been and is a member of the Communist Party of the United States.

4. That he is or was a member of the national committee (old central committee) of the Communist Party of the U. S. A.

5. That he was a member of the I. L. A. unit, waterfront section, San Francisco County, district 13 of the Communist Party for the years 1933-36.

6. That he is or was a member of unit 22, waterfront section, San Francisco County, California district of the Communist Party.

7. That he was a member of the Communist Party waterfront strike committee fraction in 1934.

8. That he was a member of the California State committee (old district 13 committee) and the California executive committee (old district 13 bureau) of the Communist Party for the years 1935-37.

9. That he is or was a member of the San Francisco waterfront section bureau of the Communist Party.

10. That he is or was a member of the Communist Party top fraction of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific.

11. That he invariably appoints Communist Party members to key positions in the maritime unions and the C. I. O.

12. That since 1934 he has advocated and reflected the policies of the Communist Party in the United States.

13. That he has conducted a campaign of defamation against those who refuse to follow Communist Party policies.

14. That he sat in the meeting of the thirteenth district bureau, Communist Party, which directed one Dave Sanders to dispose of Raoul Louis Cherbourg, who was later killed and his body, wrapped in chains, dumped into San Francisco Bay.

For further charges the committee is referred to the maritime brief, heretofore introduced.

Alfred Renton Bridges, better known as Harry Bridges, was born at 22, Macaulay Road, Kensington, Victoria, Australia, on the 6th of July 1901.

His father is Alfred Ernest Bridges and his mother, Julia (Dorgan) Bridges.

We offer in evidence of this fact a photostatic copy of a letter from the commissioner of police, Sydney, New South Wales, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 1."

The attention of the committee is called to the discrepancy in the birth date as given by Harry Bridges in various documents.

At this time we refer the committee to Men Who Lead Labor, heretofore introduced in the maritime brief as exhibit No. 3, and we quote therefrom:

Young Alfred (later renamed "Harry" by American sailors), began school before he was 5. He did well, graduated at 12, and entered St. Brennan's parochial school where he remained until he was 16. At 13 or 14 his father started to teach him the real-estate business, sending the boy out to collect rents from occupants who had taken houses and flats through the Bridges' office. Many of the families were poor; many were unable to pay. The boy disliked the job; years later he remarked that no person with any sensitivity to suffering could have collected rents in Melbourne and not have had his opinions colored by the task.

At home the boy heard politics argued continually. His father was conservative; but two uncles took an active interest in the Australian Labor Party. Charles Bridges was elected years later (1936) to the State legislature on the Labor Party ticket. Another uncle who owned aranch and who later was killed in France during the war, influenced the young boy particularly. On visits to the ranch, Alfred would listen intently to the older man's discussion of labor's needs, impressed by the repeated refrain stressing the value of a powerful labor party.

On leaving school, young Bridges clerked for a time in a retail stationery store. He had no real interest in the work, no ambition to enter his father's business. Whenever he had a chance he rushed to the docks where he could talk to foreign sailors, and watch the boats slip in and out of the harbor. He craved adventure, the chance to know other lands. Finally, he appealed to Captain Suffern, president of the Mercantile Marine Board, to persuade his father to let him go to sea. Captain Suffern spoke to the elder Bridges, told him that if he encouraged his son, the boy would certainly prove a success.

Alfred Bridges would have preferred the boy to remain in Melbourne and enter the real-estate business. But, as he related many years later:

"To test the boy's love of the sea I hatched a plot with an old Norwegian skipper who ran a ketch between Tasmania and Melbourne. The boat was very small, although seaworthy and making a stormy crossing in it was guaranteed to test the stoutest heart. During the passage with Alf aboard a storm arose. That was on the homeward trip, and the boat was blown more than 100 miles out of its course. Alf was delighted and refused to leave the deck. The skipper expected him to be washed overboard with every wave.

"After that there was no stopping the boy from going to sea. He was in two shipwrecks, including the wreck of the *Val Marie* off the Ninety-Mile Beach. Alf went overboard with my mandolin and kept afloat on it until he was picked up."

In 1920, Bridges shipped on the South Sea Island barkentine, *Ysabel*. The ship headed out across the Pacific for San Francisco. On the way, Harry and several other men objected to the captain's order that they work on Easter Monday, a regularly recognized holiday for Australian workers. Still angry when the *Ysabel* docked in San Francisco, Harry Bridges left the ship and, after paying the required head tax of \$8, entered the United States.

We see from the above that Bridges enters the United States as a deserter from a ship on which he has been insubordinate and created discontent amongst the crew. Did he do this deliberately in order to attract the attention of radicals on the San Francisco waterfront?

Immediately he looked for a job on an American vessel. For two years he sailed up and down the west coast, and to the Gulf. In 1921, his ship steamed into New Orleans, where a maritime strike was in progress. The next day Harry Bridges reported for picket duty: by the end of the strike he was in

charge of a picket squad. "I was arrested once during that time," he said, describing his introduction to police intimidation, "and held overnight but released without a court hearing; no charge was placed against me, my offense being that of a striker on picket duty."

Following the strike, he was employed as quartermaster on a Government ship chasing rum runners. When he received an honorable discharge, he decided that he had spent enough time knocking around from port to port. In October 1922 he started to work on the San Francisco water front as a longshoreman.

The workers along the Embarcadero, the wide half-moon of boulevard that bounds the expanse of concrete docks, found the young Australian engaging and witty. They joked about his cockney twang and nicknamed him "Limo." Harry Bridges, rangy and thin, with a long narrow head and black hair brushed in a pompadour, with a thin smile and sharp eyes under heavy lids, settled down to a dockworker's life. At first, he attempted single-handed to defy the company union that dominated the water front.

The committee will note that as early as 1922 Harry Bridges had commenced to organize his group of "progressives."

As the longshoremen hung about in the early morning fog, as they shivered in the rain and wind, or loitered in the fresh sunshine, they talked and Harry Bridges listened to their complaints. He would nod his narrow head, a smile curving his thin lips. "Of course," he would snort. Workers on the water front learned to expect those two impatient words from Bridges, the cocksure "of course" that invariably greeted their grumbling and preceded the angry explanation of how they could combat the employers. "Organization * * *" went the refrain, "rank and file control * * * unity of action * * * union democracy * * * solidarity among all coast ports * * * among all unions * * *."

This shows the committee that early in the "twenties" he was laying down the technique of industrial combat, using words and phrases that have been the stock words and phrases of Communist International throughout the world. We refer the committee to "Why Communism" by M. J. Oglin, exhibit No. 4 of the basic brief.

Twice Harry Bridges attempted to revive the I. L. A. on the water front. In 1924 he and a few other militants organized a local, but it lasted only a few months and collapsed ignominiously when an organizer embezzled the union funds and disappeared. Again in 1926 Bridges and the small group around him tried to interest other workers in the I. L. A., but they turned away * * *.

Who were these militants? They were none other than the Equality Hall group of Communists mentioned first on page 8 of the Maritime Brief.

About this time the father and mother of Bridges caused a "Missing Seaman" notice to be published. We introduce a photostatic copy of it herewith and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 2."

The committee will note that Harry had as his companion an ex-convict named "Red," who was the proprietor of a lodging house on Howard Street near Third in San Francisco.

We continue to quote:

He had married in 1925 and now had a family to support.

Mr. NIMMO. Mr. Chairman, may I relieve Mr. Knowles of the burden of reading this at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. NIMMO. Taking up this brief from where he left off.

At this time we refer the committee to the "first papers" for citizenship filed at various times by Bridges, and request that they note the depositions on marital status.

We now offer in evidence excerpts from the sworn statement of Harry Bridges made before the Hanna Arbitration Board, and request that the document be marked "Exhibit No. 3."

It will be noted therein that from May 11, 1929, until 1932 no account is given by Harry Bridges as to where he was. Neither is an account given by the Communists who wrote "Men Who Lead Labor."

That, by the way, is the book written by two Communists and to which we have referred in the maritime brief.

Where was Harry Bridges? Various reports have been given, none of which we have been able to verify. One significant report was that he was in France assisting the French syndicalists.

In order to maintain the chronological sequence, we now refer the committee to page 12 of the maritime brief where it was shown that Harry Bridges and another Communist, Harry Jackson, were responsible for the issuing of the *Waterfront Worker*, avowed Communist Party publication.

We quote further:

Often the Worker was hard to read because the ink blurred on the cheap paper; usually the drawings were crude. But the bulletin circulated rapidly up and down the Embarcadero and longshoremen were impressed by the sound sense that filled the four pages. Some of them recalled that the slogans stressed by the editors echoed the words that Bridges had so often repeated in the saloons across from the docks, or while standing in the shape-up line; "rank and file control," "unity of action," "union democracy." Longshoremen picked up these phrases, mulled over them until they took on a sharp meaning. The waterfront hummed with union talk. The Marine Workers Industrial Union, affiliated with the Trade Union Unity League, lent powerful aid to the agitation for organization. Then in July 1933 the campaign to form a San Francisco local of the International Longshoremen's Association commenced. Within six weeks, the overwhelming majority of longshoremen had deserted the "Blue Book" and signed with the union. President Joseph P. Ryan from his New York office saw no reason to refuse the dues of several thousand recruits. He issued a charter and forgot the incident."

The Marine Workers Industrial Union was an affiliate of the Trade Union Unity League and the TUUL, was the league created by the Communist Party of the U. S. A. Section Communist International for the purpose of capturing the trade-union movement for party control. Wm. Z. Foster, former secretary of the Communist Party, has admitted this fact before a Senate committee.

We shall now quote the Communist story in full as to the events leading up to the general strike:

The CHAIRMAN. Right at that point, may I interject this, that in the letter from Mrs. Perkins to me dated August 30, 1938, she stated:—and I am going to put in the record my letter to her and her reply—

This Department has recommended that this decision (that is the *Streecker case*) be appealed to the Supreme Court since it was recognized at once, not only by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and the Solicitor of this Department but by officials of the Department of Justice with whom they conferred, that unless this holding were reversed by the highest court that the charges brought against Bridges, even if proved, had no legal significance whatsoever.

I now compare that statement of the Secretary of Labor with the statement of the Deputy Commissioner, T. B. Shoemaker, in

his memorandum dated April 12, 1938, found in the file, in which he said:

If the Supreme Court should reverse the action of the appellate court the Government then might not have to adduce testimony as it will now that the Communist Party of the U. S. A. is a subversive organization.

Mr. NIMMO. That is a correct interpretation, without doubt—that last one.

The CHAIRMAN. So that the interpretation of the attorney was simply this, that if the *Strecker case* is reversed and if the Supreme Court follows the Circuit Court of Appeals in the Ninth Circuit, all the previous decisions to the effect that membership in the party alone is sufficient to deport, then we will not have to introduce evidence of the subversive nature of the Communist Party.

But here was the director, R. P. Bonham, who said to his own Department: "I have ample proof to show that the Communist Party preaches and advocates force and violence and," he says, "I have introduced that proof many times in similar cases on the west coast and it has always been held sufficient."

So that the Secretary's statement to me directly conflicts with the statement contained here in the memorandum of Mr. Shoemaker.

Mr. NIMMO. Not only conflicts, but the net result of that decision of the Supreme Court of the United States would be this, that even though the Supreme Court sustained the Circuit Court of Appeals, it would not affect the *Bridges case* for the reason that all the Department of Labor would have to do would be to proceed to prove that the Communist Party does advocate the use of force and violence and the overthrow of the Government, and that can be done very simply.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been done. The file is full of proof of that character. And that is only one ground in the statute.

Mr. NIMMO. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. They have charged him with violation of other acts which are grounds for deportation.

Mr. NIMMO. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And the file contains proof along each line.

Mr. NIMMO. Any one of which would be sufficient to sustain the order of deportation. And furthermore, in the back of this brief, which we will approach as we can get along, there are decisions of the various courts of the United States substantially to the effect that that is what the Communist Party does, and proof of membership is sufficient.

However, I wanted to call the committee's attention to this long excerpt which comes on page 7 of the Bridges brief and which continues on pages 8 and 9 and 10. It is a long excerpt and I do not believe the committee desires to listen to it at length, but I would like to call attention to this fact, that in the concluding paragraph on page 10 of that excerpt from "Men Who Lead Labor," written by two Communists, in their own book upon that subject, we find this significant statement:

The CHAIRMAN. All of that excerpt will be made a part of the record; this whole brief on Bridges will be made a part of the record.

(The excerpt referred to is as follows:)

Delegates from every West Coast local arrived in San Francisco for the 1934 district convention of the I. L. A. During the 14 years that the Blue Book had dominated the Embarcadero, the I. L. A. maintained locals in most of the other Pacific ports, but lacking a strong union in the main shipping center of San Francisco, the I. L. A. in Portland, Tacoma, Seattle, and elsewhere had remained, almost of necessity, inactive. With San Francisco returned to the union domain, maritime workers looked hopefully to the convention to challenge the shipowners. True, they knew that the I. L. A. officialdom was steeped in the Gompers tradition of compromise, and that the president, William J. Lewis (no relation to John L. Lewis), was both suspicious of the progressives and fearful that they would sweep him from office. True, they knew that Joseph P. Ryan, international president, supported Lewis and his clique. But the rank and file trusted the young militants, headed by Harry Bridges, who had successfully revived the union in San Francisco. And though at the convention the old guard urged a "reasonable" attitude, the majority of delegates followed the militants in voting for immediate negotiations with the owners to achieve recognition by the union, higher wages than the prevailing weekly wage of \$10, for a 30-hour week, and most important of all, a coastwide agreement.

The employers jeered at the demands. No steamship company, they argued, would sign. Behind their obstinate refusal to consider a coastwide contract was the determination to prevent unity among longshoremen in different ports. Besides, the shipowners did not take the strike threats seriously. Even if the longshoremen walked off the docks, the shipowners expected to demolish the young San Francisco local as they had in 1919. Once San Francisco was out of the way, the I. L. A. would again be helpless. Nor were the shipowners without allies; they counted on the Federal Government and the international president of the I. L. A. for help against the longshoremen.

Joseph P. Ryan had studied William Hutcheson's methods and had proved an apt pupil. Like Hutcheson, Ryan had his fingers in more than one pie: as president of the New York Central Trades and Labor Council, as president of the Joseph P. Ryan Association, he had influence wherever the power of Tamany Hall extended. "I'm a machine man," he boasted, "and I head a machine." For 20 years he had dominated the east coast, and his business agents—"gorillas," the longshoremen called them—"dominated" the docks and succeeded, for the most part, in keeping them free from progressives. Ryan did not differ from most of the top officials of the A. F. of L. in his hate and fear of militants. When, therefore, the western shipowners informed Ryan that the rank and file along the Pacific was controlled by "reds" and when William J. Lewis confirmed this report, Ryan did not hesitate to cooperate with the employers.

His collaboration wasn't enough. The rank and file countered the owners' refusal to discuss the union's demands by voting to strike on March 23, 1934. The workers pointed to the N. R. A., which promised them the right to organize into unions of their own choosing for purposes of collective bargaining. In desperation, the employers turned from Ryan to the Federal Government. The Regional Labor Board, in the person of George Creel, offered to mediate; the employers agreed, except that they refused to deal with the union or discuss the I. L. A. demands. As March 23 drew too close for comfort, Creel appealed to President Roosevelt, who requested the longshoremen to wait and in turn appointed his own mediation board. The owners smiled to themselves, knowing that nothing demoralized workers so successfully as postponement and indecision.

Negotiations dragged on. The shipowners flatly declared that they would never recognize the union or consider a coastwide contract. But they did persuade William J. Lewis, eager to prevent the strike, to endorse a meaningless agreement which despite its verbiage did not change conditions on the docks. The longshoremen balked and on May 9, 1934, walked off the docks. The strike was on.

Immediately the strikers expanded their demands to include union control of hiring halls, in place of the shape-up system, and institution of the closed shop on the waterfront. Calling on all other marine unions for support, and on the teamsters not to haul to and from the docks, the longshoremen stretched picket lines along every waterfront from Vancouver to San Diego.

Immediately the Marine Workers International Union struck in full support of the longshoremen and helped to swell the picket lines.

The pressing problem was to spread the strike. Harry Bridges and other rank and file leaders were determined not to repeat the mistakes of 1919. Though strongly opposed by Michael Case, for 40 years president of the teamsters, the longshoremen induced the teamsters to stay away from the docks for the duration of the strike. Engineers, cooks and stewards, mates, pilots, seamen filtered off the ships. Their officials harangued, threatened, promised them anything if they would only remain to work. But in a week Paul Scharrenberg, head of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, wired William Green, lamenting that he could no longer restrain the membership and was forced in self-preservation to declare a sympathy strike. A week later the sailors presented their own demands to the employers. The experience of the Sailors' Union was repeated in the other marine unions whose membership joined the picket lines and presented demands to the shipowners.

Shipping stopped. But the shipowners were still not overly disquieted. They could starve the men out and in the meantime they had their Government subsidies. These amounted in many cases to more than the companies expended in annual wages, subsistence, maintenance, and repair charge combined! In a report to President Roosevelt, Postmaster General Farley estimated that the subsidy cost the Government altogether \$70,618,096.06. The salaries of corporation officials, largely paid out of subsidies, reached staggering figures: Four stockholders of the Dollar Line received from 1923 to 1932 a total in salaries, profits, and bonuses of \$14,690,528. So when the strike stopped shipping, the corporations anticipated no great loss—the Government paid the deficit. The corporations sat back and waited.

To put the strike on a firm footing, the militants proposed that no union settle or arbitrate its demands until all other unions had received agreements satisfactory to their memberships. The unions agreed, and further pledged themselves to hold out for a coastwide agreement. To coordinate their activities they set up a joint marine strike committee, composed of five delegates from each union elected by and responsible to the rank and file, with Harry Bridges as chairman. For the first time in American labor history, both licensed and unlicensed personnel cooperated on an equal basis, breaking down craft jealousies which had riddled the marine industry. And for the first time in many years, the rank and file fully controlled the conduct of a major strike.

It was not all smooth sailing. The unions cooperated willingly enough, but the employers too were mobilizing. Edward F. McGrady, Government "trouble shooter," arrived in the West, and set to work to break the strike. He got nowhere. "I've been able to crack other strikes," he complained, "but I can't crack this strike." At McGrady's suggestion, Angelo Rossi, mayor of San Francisco, summoned Joseph P. Ryan. But Ryan lacked authority. In 1911, when the Pacific Coast district had rejoined the I. L. A. from which it had previously seceded, the international granted the district complete autonomy, and agreed that international officers should have no jurisdiction in Coast affairs unless their assistance was specifically requested. When he arrived in San Francisco in May 1934, Ryan strutted and wheedled, bullied and aggrued, and finally signed a secret pact with the employers ending the walkout. Hutcheson had used the same trick many times. The newspapers rejoiced at the strike's termination. But when the longshoremen read the terms which failed to provide any improvement in working conditions, and in addition violated the pledge entered into by all striking unions that any settlement must include every union involved, they repudiated Ryan and the agreement. The international president hurriedly left for the East—miserable over the miscarriage of his most zealous strikebreaking.

All hope of ending the walkout by bartering with corrupt union officials melted away. Nor had attempts to "buy" Bridges helped the employers' cause. They turned to force and calumny. With Hearst leading, the press attacked Bridges as a Communist and alien, and demanded his arrest and deportation. The police harassed the picket lines, jailed militants, slugged, beat, terrorized. The workers only drew their lines tighter about the docks. More than ever they looked to Bridges for leadership. The "red" scare fell on deaf ears. "I neither affirm nor deny that I am a Communist," Bridges replied to newspaper charges, and pointed out that political beliefs had nothing to do with the issues in the strike.

Yet Bridges did not hesitate to accept aid from the Communist Party. Two years later, John L. Lewis also learned to welcome all support from

workers regardless of their political affiliations. To Harry Bridges, it was obvious that the Communist Party would not only cooperate wholeheartedly and effectively with the maritime workers, but could also give invaluable advice on the conduct and development of the strike. In addition, the rank and file of the water-front unions found that the Communist workers were the most militant, the most self-sacrificing, and the most consistent elements in their ranks. The membership of the various unions adopted the *Western Worker*, official party organ, as the official newspaper of the strikers.

Mr. NIMMO. That last goes right to the very root of our contention, that back of all this is the Communist Party, the Communist Party tactics, their program, and their ideology.

The CHAIRMAN. You, of course, are a practicing attorney. The Circuit Court of Appeals of the Ninth District in which Harry Bridges resides has held many times that it is not necessary to prove membership in the Communist Party. But, as a matter of practice, the Immigration Service would introduce their stock proof, what they call stock proof, that the Communist Party advocates force and violence, and the courts in a long line of decisions have held that that proof was sufficient to establish the revolutionary character of the Communist Party.

Mr. NIMMO. I think that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. To meet the requirements of the statute.

Mr. NIMMO. That is my understanding of it; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And I ask you again if this is not true, that the Supreme Court has held many times that in deportation cases, each case stands on its own merits?

Mr. NIMMO. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That the only two things you can prove to reverse a decision of a lower court or the order of the Secretary deporting an alien is that he did not have a fair trial, for one; that is, one ground is the absence of a fair trial?

Mr. NIMMO. And the other one is a complete showing of those material elements by some amount of testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. They have got to have some testimony?

Mr. NIMMO. Some testimony, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. So that the decision in the New Orleans district was no precedent whatsoever—that is, the ninth district of the Circuit Court of Appeals. Since the Supreme Court has held many times that each case stands on its own merits and is to be governed by the facts in that particular case, the *New Orleans case* had absolutely nothing in the world to do with the *Bridges case*. And it indicates that the *New Orleans case* was seized upon as a welcome opportunity to suspend deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges?

Mr. NIMMO. That would be my conclusion, right to a "T." I cannot see any other interpretation you can put on it, because the *Strecker case* can have no influence in the long run, upon the *Bridges case*.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, in the case of *Sagansky v. Weed*, the court said:

In order successfully to attack by judicial proceedings the conclusions and orders made upon such hearings (hearings of the immigration officers) it must be shown that the proceedings were manifestly unfair, that the action of executive officers were such as to prevent a fair investigation or that there was a manifest abuse of the discretion committed to them by the statute.

So that there is very little ground for appeal from a deportation order?

MR. NIMMO. Ordinarily so; yes, sir. It is one of those cases where there would be very little ground; in fact, the ordinary attitude of any court is that it will not interfere with the discretion of the quasijudicial tribunal where there is some evidence on which to base the decision of that tribunal.

THE CHAIRMAN. To show that the Department of Labor had ample testimony before it upon which to predicate proceedings in deportation, and go through with it, I want to quote—without giving the names of the witnesses whose names appear in this file, who made depositions conducted by the Immigration Service—some excerpts, in order to show that independent of all that you have now presented here there was and is sufficient evidence in this file to justify the deportation of Harry Bridges, not only on the one ground that he is a Communist and belongs to a revolutionary party, but upon the other grounds concerning which no statement has been made. This particular witness, without naming him, testified that he had seen Harry Bridges pay an assessment of \$2 to the Communist Party and that he saw him pay membership dues.

This witness further testified that Bridges on one occasion made the statement when he saw United States battleships in the harbor that, "We will see the day when we can sink those damned things because they are the enemies of the workers."

The witness further testified that, "On occasions, he, Bridges, stated that his workout squads in San Francisco take good care of all opponents of the labor movement of the Communist Party by having them beat up, destroying their homes, and other methods of driving fear into the weak workers of the water front."

That comes in under the section of the statute dealing with sabotage, does it not?

MR. NIMMO. Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN. The witness was asked what the prime objective was of the Communist Party in the United States and he answered:

To bring about a revolution which will change the form of government in the United States, make it the Soviet Union of the United States.

There was testimony that they did not have in the *Strecker case*, according to Judge Hutchison, testimony of the revolutionary character of the Communist Party, is not that a fact?

MR. NIMMO. That is absolutely true.

THE CHAIRMAN. He testified that the Communist Party believes in the abolishment of private ownership of all properties and methods of operating the Government and to establish in their place a Soviet government.

Another witness testified that—

Bridges has done more than any one person to split unity on the water front of the Pacific coast. He has said things which would lead to violent attacks of class against class. He has placed members of the Communist Party in control of strategic points in various west coast unions in the C. I. O.

Another witness testified that he had accused the Communist Party of district 13 of holding secret meetings in various parts of San Francisco to which the various members of local 3879—who were continuously trying their disruptive methods and otherwise to take

over the control, the policies, and various activities of the local—were attending these meetings of the executive board of district No. 13, Communist Party. This witness said that his accusations aroused the antipathy of Harry Bridges.

This witness testified that the interest and concern of Harry Bridges leaned toward the Communist movement rather than the men he was supposed to represent in the I. L. A.

This witness said that he asked Bridges whether or not he would go against the wishes of the President of the United States and that Bridges said, "To hell with the President of the United States." And that Bridges further said that he had more power behind him than the Government of the United States and that before 3 years he would be in a position to prove his statement.

I only read certain excerpts from the sworn testimony of witnesses which the Department of Labor had before it when they suspended all deportation proceedings on account of a case wherein the court said:

The reason that we reverse the case is because you did not prove sufficiently that this man either preached revolution or that he belonged to a party that preached revolution or that he preached sabotage or came within one of the grounds of the statute.

So that considering that testimony, it supports R. F. Bonham's statement to the Department that he had sufficient evidence to comply with the *Strecker case*. It not only supports that, but how can you interpret that, in the light of Secretary Perkins' letter to me in which she makes the statement that the *Strecker case*, unless it is reversed by the Supreme Court, will make utterly impossible the deportation of Harry Bridges?

Mr. NIMMO. It cannot be reconciled.

The CHAIRMAN. I might say also that one of the answers that was given to my inquiry when, as chairman of this committee, seeking light, I wrote a courteous letter to the Secretary, who is a servant of the people, just like all of us, was this:

Perhaps it is fortunate that Shirley Temple was born an American citizen and that we will not have to debate the issue raised by the preposterous revelations of your committee in regard to this innocent and likeable child.

That was the type of letter that was sent me by a Cabinet officer in response to a courteous and sincere effort to find out what the facts were in this case.

My letter of September 29, 1938, to the Secretary of Labor, and her reply of September 30, will be put in the record at this point.

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

AUGUST 29, 1938.

MADAM FRANCES PERKINS,
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM SECRETARY: I have carefully considered the file on the Harry Bridges case which your Department turned over to us recently.

I can find no justification for the action of the Department in suspending or postponing deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges. The memo submitted to you on April 15, 1938, by James L. Houghteling, Commissioner of Immigration, recommends the postponement of deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges on the ground that the case of *Strecker v. Kessler* would prevent the deportation of Harry Bridges if this decision is sustained by the Supreme Court. I cannot see how the *Strecker case* would have any bearing upon the Harry Bridges case since the facts in the two cases are dissimilar. In addition to this, the *Strecker*

case was decided by the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Fifth Circuit. Harry Bridges resides in the ninth circuit and the decisions of that circuit will unquestionably sustain deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges. In addition to the decisions of the ninth circuit, in which Harry Bridges resides, there are other decisions, including the Supreme Court case of *Vajtauer v. Commissioner* (275 U. S. 103), which not only authorize but require the deportation of Harry Bridges.

As previously stated it is my opinion that the case of *Strecker v. Kessler* is not applicable to the facts in the Bridges case. In the Strecker decision the court merely held that membership in the Communist Party of America, standing alone, is not sufficient to warrant deportation. The court said: "We agree with appellant, however, that the purported finding that he believes in and teaches, and belongs to or did belong to, an organization which believes in and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States is without any support in the evidence, is a mere flating. The proceedings as a whole and the questioning and summary in particular, are dramatic illustrations of tyranny of labels over certain types of minds. The evidence and only evidence relied on for the finding and order is that during the Presidential campaign of 1932, when Foster was running as a white and one Ford as a colored candidate for the Communist Party of America for President of the United States, appellant, in November 1932, became a member of the Communist Party and accepted certain literature of the Communist Party for distribution. * * * He did not testify, nor did anyone else, that he believed in the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States, neither did he, nor anyone else, testify that the organization he had belonged to, the Communist Party of America, taught, advocated, or incited such overthrow. None of the literature which he was supposed to have circulated in 1932 was introduced, but his book of membership in the Communist Party in the United States was. Not a word in this membership book advocated, incited, or even suggested that the Government of the United States should be overthrown by force or violence. * * * The statute invoked does not forbid membership in the Communist or any other party, except one that teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States."

Your file discloses a number of depositions of witnesses who testified that Harry Bridges was a member of the Communist Party.

Your file also discloses ample evidence that the Communist Party of the United States of America advocates and teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence.

We have promised not to disclose the names of any of these witnesses but one witness testified under oath that the Communist Party of the United States did advocate and teach the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence. This witness testified that he had seen Harry Bridges pay an assessment of \$2 to the Communist Party and that he saw him pay membership dues. This witness further testified that Bridges on one occasion made the statement when he saw the United States battleships in the harbor that, "We will see a day when we can sink those damn things because they are the enemy of the workers." The witness further testified, "And on occasions he (Bridges) stated that his work-out squads in San Francisco take good care of all opponents of the labor movement of the Communist Party by having them beat up, destroying their homes and other methods of driving fear into the weak workers of the water front." The witness was asked what was the prime objective of the Communist Party in the United States and he answered, "To bring about a revolution which will change the form of government in the United States, make it the Soviet Union of the United States." He testified that the Communist Party believes in the abolishment of private ownership of all properties and methods of operating the Government and to establish in their place a Soviet Government."

Another witness testified that "Bridges has done more than any other person to split up unity on the water front of the Pacific coast. He has said things which would lead to violent attitudes of class against class. He has placed members of the Communist Party in control of strategic points in various west-coast unions and in the C. I. O."

Another witness testified that he had accused the Communist Party of district 13 of holding secret meetings at various parts of San Francisco, at which the various members of local No. 38-79, who were continuously trying their disruptive methods and otherwise to take over and control the policies

and various activities of the local, were attending these meetings of the executive board of the district No. 13 Communist Party.

This witness said that his accusations aroused the antipathy of Harry Bridges. This witness testified that the interest and concern of Harry Bridges leaned toward the Communist movement rather than the men whom he was supposed to represent in the I. L. A. This witness said that he asked Bridges whether or not he would go against the wishes of the President of the United States and that Bridges said, "to hell with the President of the United States," and that Bridges further said that he had more power behind him than the Government of the United States, and that before 3 years he would be in a position to prove his statements.

I could quote from the testimony of other witnesses to show that even under the *Strecker case* there is ample evidence in your file to warrant the deportation of Harry Bridges, but this is unnecessary and I do not want to reveal any more of the contents of your file than is absolutely necessary to sustain our contention that your action in postponing the deportation proceedings is without justification.

The statutes make mandatorily deportable "Aliens who believe in, advise, advocate, or teach, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, or teaches—

"(1) The overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law, or (2) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character, or (3) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property, or (4) sabotage."

The statute likewise makes deportable aliens who advise opposition to organized forms of government: overthrow by force or violence of the United States Government or all forms of law: unlawful assaulting or killing of Government officers, unlawful damage, etc., to property; or sabotage.

I cite you the case of *Vilarino v. Garity, Immigration Inspector*, decided by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth District, which is the district in which Bridges resides. This decision may be found in 50 Federal (2d) 582.

I also cite the case of *Branch v. Cahill*, 88 Federal (2d) 545, decided February 23, 1937, by the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Ninth District. In this case the court held that there was ample evidence to show that the appellant was affiliated with the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

I also cite you the case of *Kenmotsa v. Nagle, Immigration Commissioner*, 44 Federal (2d) 953, in which the circuit court of appeals affirmed the deportation proceedings based upon the fact that the petitioner was present as a member of the Communist Party at a gathering or demonstration where various placards were carried and displayed by various persons attending the gathering.

I also cite you to the Supreme Court decision of *Vajtlauer v. Commissioner*, 273 U. S. 103, decided by the Supreme Court.

Even if the Supreme Court should later sustain the holding in the *Strecker case* to the effect that membership in the Communist Party of America, standing alone, is not sufficient to warrant deportation, this will not preclude the deportation of Harry Bridges, because you have additional evidence in the *Bridges case* which was not presented in the *Strecker case* to show that the Communist Party teaches the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States. In this connection we wish to call to your attention the letter of Mr. R. P. Bonham, dated May 11, 1938, to Commissioner Houghteling, in which he says: "The witnesses we had assembled for the Bridges hearing had among them some former functionaries of the party who were well informed and who would have testified to the Communist Party of the United States of America, being the American section of the Comintern (Communist International) and to the definite commitment to force and violence in bringing about the overthrow of our Government."

Mr. Bonham also offered to supply you with literature of the Communist Party advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. In this connection he said to Commissioner Houghteling, "I have always been able to introduce these books to prove the charge that the alien belonged to an organization that printed and published, etc., literature advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. The courts have, without exception, dismissed writs challenging this procedure in cases which I have conducted."

I wish to call your attention to the telegram, dated April 20, 1938, sent by Mr. Bonham, who is the district director of the Seattle district, to Commissioner Houghteling, which reads as follows:

"Radio news announces your continuance Bridges hearing until Supreme Court decides New Orleans case. Hope this is incorrect as difficult protect our witnesses indefinitely. I have examined the entire record, testimony, and court decision, said case. Service failed introduce adequate proof party teaches violence. We have ample such evidence both in current official party documents and on part of witnesses. New Orleans case weak and devoid proper proof, therefore not hurtful or controlling our case. Hope same will not be regarded as precedent or of sufficient consequence to postpone pending case. Please wire instructions.

"(Signed) BONHAM."

Commissioner Houghteling reprimanded Mr. Bonham for this telegram in a letter which he wrote him April 20, 1938. Among other things, Commissioner Houghteling said:

"Let me say at this point that your ill-judged telegram just received appears to me to deserve prompt and unfavorable comment. When you were in Washington I drew your attention, in the *Pritchett case*, to the bad judgment shown by local inspectors in trying to impose their own opinions as to the value of certain facts and testimony in problems being handled by the central office. You say in your telegram of this morning that you have made a thorough study of the *Strecker case* and believe the decision not hurtful in the present instance. In making this statement you oppose your judgment to that of the central office and of the Department of Justice, and that on the basis of an imperfect knowledge of all the facts in both the *Strecker case* and the *Bridges case*. This arrogance of judgment and apparent zeal to put your superiors in the wrong is not the cooperation that I have a right to expect from you.

"I also want to call your attention to the letter dated September 23, 1937, from R. P. Bonham to Edward J. Shoughnessy which contains the following paragraph:

"I believe it proper that I acquaint the central office with the fact that when I interviewed Mr. Bridges some time ago on another matter he boasted that he had seen the central office file relating to himself, and also that "they" had an excellent "intelligence" organization of their own that kept them well informed of what was going on. Several of the witnesses in behalf of the Government are fearful of their lives, if ahead of the hearing the fact of their having testified becomes known to the alien or the Communists. There will be no "leak" in this end and may I not in order that their lives may not be unduly endangered, adjure the central office and the Department to observe the greatest precautions to safeguard inviolate this record."

"(Signed) 'R. P. BONHAM.'"

"Deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges should be commenced without any further delay, not only because the statute and decisions require such proceedings but because delay may, if it has not already done so, place the witnesses beyond the reach of the Government and make it impossible to make out a case.

"The majority of the Committee on Un-American Activities and Propaganda have authorized me to write you in respect to these matters.

"Sincerely yours,

"MARTIN DIES,

"Chairman, Special Committee on Un-American Activities."

"Attest,

"ROBERT STRIPLING, Secretary."

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 30, 1938.

HON. MARTIN DIES,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DIES: I noticed that the press today published excerpts from a letter which it was stated you had addressed to me with respect to the file on the immigration and deportation case of Harry Bridges, which was submitted to your committee at their request. Subsequently, the original of this letter was delivered to my office and I beg to acknowledge receipt of the same.

In this letter you advised me that you could find no justification for the action of the Department in postponing deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges. You are so good as to favor me with a rather long dissertation on the various cases decided by the courts under the immigration law as well as long quotations from the immigration law itself. Fortunately I am already fairly familiar with these cases and the law as it has been studied very carefully both in this and in other cases involving deportation of aliens charged with being members of an organization which advocates the overthrow of government by force and violence (act of 1918, as amended by the act of 1920).

It was pointed out to you that the hearings on charges filed against Harry Bridges in this respect were postponed after the decision of the circuit court in the case of *Strecker v. Kessler*. You urge and recommend me to proceed with deportation hearings at once in spite of this important decision. As a member of Congress, of course, I have the greatest respect for you and for your views on any subject coming within your jurisdiction. I am sure that you appreciate that the matter of method and of how and when to proceed is one that concerns the administrative branch of the government and that it is not usual for the legislative branch which has so many duties to attempt to usurp the functions and duties of the administrative branch.

I cannot accept your analysis and evaluation of the evidence in the case and the hearing of the court decisions upon it as it appears to me to have been made without sufficient knowledge of the law and of the very varied line of decisions which the courts have handed down in this class of cases. You are incorrect in saying that the facts in the two cases are dissimilar. As a matter of fact they are identical except for the fact that Strecker admitted that he was a Communist and that he distributed Communist literature whereas Bridges has not so admitted. In other words, the case in regard to Strecker is much stronger. You are also incorrect in your understanding of the *Vajtauer case* (*Vajtauer v. Commissioner of Immigration*, 273 U. S. 103) which, on your interpretation, "requires" the deportation of Harry Bridges. Since receiving your letter I have reread the decision of the Supreme Court case cited by you (*Vajtauer v. Commissioner of Immigration* (*supra*), to ascertain the basis for your assertion that this case "requires the deportation of Harry Bridges." I found that the case, the facts in which bear only the remotest resemblance to the Bridges charges, contained a holding directly contrary to your contention. The Court, far from saying that deportation in that case was required, stated that "a want of due process is not established by showing merely that the decision (of the Secretary of Labor) is erroneous * * * or that incompetent evidence was received and considered * * * it is sufficient that there was some evidence from which the conclusion of the administrative tribunal could be deduced and that it committed no error so flagrant as to convince a court of the essential unfairness of the trial."

As you are undoubtedly aware (although your letter does not mention it), the Department long prior to your investigation had issued a warrant in the *Bridges case* on the basis of the affidavits submitted to the Immigration and Naturalization Service and had set down the matter for hearing. Prior to the date of this hearing the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in a case entitled *Strecker v. Kessler* rendered a decision holding that membership in the Communist Party is not a ground for deportation. This Department has recommended that this decision be appealed to the Supreme Court since it was recognized at once, not only the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and the Solicitor of this Department but by officials of the Department of Justice with whom they conferred, that unless this holding were reversed by the highest court that the charges brought against Bridges, even if proved, had no legal significance whatsoever. Accordingly, in keeping with the usual governmental legal practice of avoiding unnecessary expense and multiple litigation in the lower courts, when a test case is pending in the higher courts, action in pending cases, including the *Bridges case* among others, based solely on membership in the Communist Party, was suspended until the Supreme Court had passed on this question. The warrants in this class of cases have not been canceled.

Summarized briefly, your advice seems to be that I should have ignored the most recent holding of the courts, overruled the legal advisers provided me by law, and have ordered the Service to proceed with the *Bridges case* in the face of my knowledge that even if the evidence at the hearing should sustain the charges, deportation itself could not be effected until the conflict

of decisions among the circuit courts had been ultimately resolved by the highest tribunal.

You have also cited a number of decisions to show that the decision in the *Strecker case* is not in harmony with earlier decisions rendered by some other Federal courts. The Department was fully aware of this as the file itself shows that the only ground for asking for certiorari was because of a conflict among the circuit courts of appeal. You make no mention in your letter of the legal memorandum prepared in the solicitor's office which was in the file sent you for inspection at your request and which recites all the facts and law.

The function of the United States Government in enforcing the immigration law is a quasi judicial process of administrative law. It is therefore of utmost importance that in the carrying out of this process there should be absolute adherence to the Constitution, to the rights of individuals, and a punctilious regard for all those safeguards of procedure which long experience has taught us preserve for men their liberty, their freedom, and their opportunity to enjoy and profit by a democracy. The fact that Communists are unpopular, and I agree in this, does not justify us in placing within that category every other unpopular person, nor in deporting them without a scrupulous regard for the due process of law, the clear and certain ruling of the courts and the facts in the case.

Perhaps it is fortunate that Shirley Temple was born an American citizen and that we will not have to debate the issue raised by the preposterous revelations of your committee in regard to this innocent and likeable child. I cannot agree that I should have disregarded the recommendations of the administrative and legal offices of this Department and of the Department of Justice in this case.

Very truly yours,

FRANCES V. PERKINS.

Please proceed.

Mr. NIMMO. We request the committee to consider that only through Harry Bridges could the Communist Party influence the tactics of the strike.

On pages 186 and 187 we find the story of defiance to public authority; we quote:

On July 5, "Bloody Thursday," the police charged the workers' lines, gassed pickets, shot into the ranks of unarmed men. Over 100 fell wounded, two men lay dead. That same evening the National Guard marched into San Francisco and Governor Merriam—whose campaign chest was immediately enriched by a \$30,000 "voluntary" contribution from the shipowners—declared martial law along the Embarcadero.

The CHAIRMAN. If I may interrupt you again to interpolate for the purpose of the record a statement by Gerard D. Reilly, solicitor of the Department of Labor, in his memorandum on the *Bridges case* and the *Strecker case*, as follows:

As a matter of fact, the affidavits on which the warrant is based do not show that Bridges personally at any time advocated any doctrines proscribed by the statutes, so that the sole ground alleged is that based on membership in the Communist Party.

Please proceed.

Mr. NIMMO (continuing):

The two murdered strikers, one of them a Communist, lay in state in the I. L. A. hall 1 block from the waterfront. For 72 hours, a double line of workers shuffled past the biers. On the fourth day following the killings, with troops patrolling the docks, the workers of San Francisco and their sympathizers gathered to bury the dead. Bareheaded, jamming the street for 5 blocks, they listened to the funeral oration thunder from the amplifiers above the doorway of the union hall. "You have been killed because of your activity in the labor movement. Your death will guide us to our final victory. Your killing has been inspired by the industrial association and the chamber of commerce. But organized labor will answer that deed many-fold throughout the land." The two coffins were carried to the street, placed reverently on the

waiting trucks. As they moved slowly into Market Street, the procession of workers formed—40,000 tense, silent, bitter men, women, and children.

Chief of Police Quinn had "forbidden" the funeral. But when the ominously quiet tide of marchers flowed into the streets behind the trucks and muffled drums, the police disappeared. All that long July afternoon the cortege tramped through the city, through walls of hushed spectators massed on the sidewalks.

Almost every Bay Region local demanded a general strike in protest against the industrial association's killings and against the militia on the waterfront. Labor council officials, when they could no longer resist the demand for a general strike, decided to head the movement. On July 16, all industry (except for gas and electricity, telephone, water, and the press) ceased. San Francisco was gripped by the first general strike in America in 15 years, the second in the history of American unionism.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, the great significance of this is that this story is written by two Communists. It is written from a Communist angle and viewpoint. It is describing an incident in which this man Harry Bridges was the main factor, the leader.

The CHAIRMAN. Some of the testimony from which I am reading excerpts was given by self-admitted Communists.

Mr. NIMMO. Yes; there is no doubt about that. I do not think there is any doubt, while he said Bridges had never definitely admitted his membership in the party—he may have on one occasion, nevertheless, he never denies his membership in the party.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to make it clear that a man can be deported under this statute who is not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. NIMMO. He does not need to be a Communist?

The CHAIRMAN. That is another misunderstanding that has gone out over the country, that you have got to prove that a man is a member of the Communist Party. But there are four grounds under the statute which may be used. If a man advocates sabotage, the destruction of property, or has engaged in it and is an alien, he is deportable under the laws of this Government.

Mr. NIMMO. There can be no question about that, and there can be no question about the fact that he can be deported upon several different grounds. And furthermore, that the reason for delaying the deportation hearings could not have been anything but a subterfuge.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the fact that there are other cases just like that rouse a certain amount of inquiry in a man's mind? For instance, Joseph Kowalski, in Detroit, also identified in labor movements, is the same sort of a case. He was deported to Russia, came back to the United States, was arrested many times, and is still in the United States.

Mr. NIMMO. There are probably many others?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no "probably" about it. We have the record of seven or eight in the same category.

What is the probability that when this thing is all over—of course, according to the Secretary of Labor, if the *Strecker case* is affirmed, that is the end of the *Bridges case*. That is the only interpretation you can reach from reading her letter. But assuming that the *Strecker case* is reversed, what assurance will there be that these witnesses whose depositions they have here will ever show up? In other words, Mr. Bonhan, in his telegram, warned the Department that if this case is continued, there was danger of the witnesses

being dispersed. Mr. Shoemaker, in the letter that appears in the memorandum dated April 12, 1938, says:

We should not lose sight of the fact that in delaying the hearings of Harry Bridges, we may not later be able to secure all the witnesses whose testimony has been given in the preliminary

And I call your attention to the fact that that paragraph is penciled; it is the original letter, signed by Shoemaker, with a pencil mark going in that direction on it [exhibiting letter]. So that the delay which has already been occasioned may mean victory for Harry Bridges; because if it is true that the names of these witnesses have leaked out, or if Bridges has sources of information which will enable him to know who the witnesses are, and if Markham has been subjected to intimidation—if all that be true, then regardless which way the *Streecker case* may go, there is a danger that Mr. Bridges will never be deported.

Mr. NIMMO. I think there is a very serious danger of that, anyway, Mr. Chairman.

To continue: We refer the committee to pages 37 to 40 of the maritime brief for further exposition of the general strike phase.

On page 191 we find:

At all times Bridges promoted consolidation. Unity, he contended, which had won the 1934 strike, could be preserved only by assuring future cooperation among maritime workers. In 1935, he urged the formation of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, with which all marine and water-front unions would affiliate and which would coordinate the activities of all members. Accordingly, seven marine unions voted to set up the Maritime Federation, pledged to carry forward the campaign to organize the unorganized which John L. Lewis had advocated at the 1934 American Federation of Labor convention.

The formation of the semiindustrial Maritime Federation impressed non-water-front workers with the success of union democracy. Harry Bridges explained what this democracy meant to him as a union officer: "I speak for the men," he made clear, "I act and talk as they want me to." His task as he saw it was "to keep as close contact as possible with the rank and file membership, not to let my new position isolate me from the men." The need to reflect the thoughts and desires of the International Longshoremen's Association membership was the core of Bridges' trade-union philosophy. No phrasemaker, never a spellbinder, he approached the workers with a cold logic, both simple and straightforward. He paced the platform at union mass meetings, punctuating patient explanations with an odd little hop at the end of his sentences. He had no desire to stampede his listeners with dramatics. A quick negotiator, sure of mass support since final authority rested with the membership, Bridges maintained a detached calm even under attack, and a self assurance that maddened the employers.

If Harry Bridges had been satisfied only to talk democracy and had done no more about it, the American Federation of Labor officials would not have been disturbed. But like John L. Lewis, who insisted on more than lip service to his demand for industrial unionism, Bridges carried out the methods he advised. "A lot of fellows," he commented, "want to get up and express themselves. It has been a terrific job to get the floor for them. Our rule is that they shall have their say * * *". Talk, however, was not sufficient. "* * * if they tear down, they must offer a substitute * * *. I believe in free expression and explaining every policy."

On pages 194 and 195 we find:

With the docks solidly organized, with not a single member of the San Francisco International Longshoremen's Association local on relief in the fall of 1935, with unemployment practically abolished on the Pacific water fronts, the rank and file demanded the spread of unionization to all categories of workers. Early in 1936, the maritime unions' "march inland" commenced in earnest. The slogan of the Maritime Federation, "An injury to one is an injury to all!"

----- was not merely an insistence on solidarity among affiliated unions; it was likewise an acknowledgment that an advance achieved by one sector of the working class could be preserved only if all other sectors were organized.

The CHAIRMAN. In that connection, may I interject something in connection with a statement by Miss Perkins to me—an emphatic statement—that this decision in the *Strecker case* would prevent the deportation of Harry Bridges. Here is a letter dated April 15, 1938, addressed to Hon. Edward W. Cahill, District Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service, San Francisco, Calif. Mr. Houghteling, by the way, has charge of this matter as Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization. He has charge of the whole thing, but, of course, her decision can reverse his. Referring to the *Strecker case* he says:

This decision is directly contradictory of numerous other decisions, but as it stands is somewhat prejudicial to our case for the deportation of Bridges by mere membership in the Communist Party.

There is a big difference between a case being prejudicial and a case that would apparently prevent deportation. I want to call attention to the further fact that they still insist that is the only ground for deportation—that is, membership in the Communist Party; whereas, as I have shown from reading of the files, he was charged with all the grounds under the statute. There was evidence of other grounds, as well as membership in the Communist Party.

Mr. NIMMO. And there is apparently ample evidence to sustain any one of those charges, any one of which would be a ground for deportation. Reading further from the brief—

The longshoremen led the way. Warehouse workers had been placed under the International Longshoremen's Association jurisdiction in 1917, yet at the conclusion of the 1934 strike, the Warehousemen's Union had recruited at most 300 members. The International Longshoremen's Association set out to bring the warehousemen into the union. By the end of 1936, 4,500 workers had been enrolled, and had obtained a closed-shop agreement, substantial wage increases, 40-hour week, and other major concessions. With the encouragement of the International Longshoremen's Association, the union organized in San Francisco all wholesale coffee houses, wholesale grocery, hardware, drug, hay, fuel, and feed firms, as well as cold-storage plants and the general warehouses. Barge-men and workers in sugar refineries received aid from the longshoremen in unionizing their industries.

Inspired by the solidarity on the water front, bakery-wagon drivers in various parts of California unified their locals. The retail clerks, affected by the upsurge of militancy in other unions, invaded department and chain stores. Striking lettuce pickers in Salinas, 100 miles south of San Francisco, turned to the International Longshoremen's Association for financial aid when vigilantes attempted to forcibly break their union. Unemployed organizations received longshoremen's backing in their opposition to curtailment of relief and the lowering of relief standards and wages. In the Northwest, lumber workers set up an alliance similar to the Maritime Federation and pledged to cooperate with the water-front unions. Industrial workers rallied to the support of the Newspaper Guild in Seattle, with the result that the success of the Post-Intelligencer strike caused every major newspaper in the Bay region to enter into agreements with the newswriters. Even Los Angeles, stronghold of the open shop on the Pacific coast, was invaded by the unions with increasing success.

And on page 195:

Harry Bridges, elected president of the west coast district of the International Longshoremen's Association in the summer of 1936, was also anxious to enlist agricultural workers into powerful unions.

And—

"Of course, we favor industrial unionism. We are strongly opposed to splitting the labor movement. But as yet possibilities of industrial unionism on the west coast are hard to predict. The first job here is to organize the unorganized on an industrial basis * * * the real drive, of course, must start in the mass industries—in steel, auto, rubber. On the waterfront here our organization is not dissimilar to the industrial setup."

He was at that time connected with the Maritime unions, and this developed, from Communist sources, his intention to start a march to take over other lines of industrial organization.

The committee will note that the above, stated by Communists themselves, is substantiation of charge 12, namely that Harry Bridges advocates and carries out the policies of the Communist Party. This is further substantiated by the evidence given in connection with the maritime brief. (See pp. 104 to 108.)

In June, 1937 we find:

When it became obvious that the executive council had no interest in unity, Harry Bridges took the leadership of the progressives who advocated that the maritime unions join the C. I. O.

And—

Long before John L. Lewis began to concede the importance of labor's independent action, Harry Bridges advocated labor's political as well as economic organization. Class antagonisms, he knew, could not be eliminated by denying their existence. When labor learned to acknowledge the fundamental opposition between workers and owners, it would then organize realistically to keep and extend democracy, civil rights, free speech. Logically, therefore, labor must enter politics with its own program, fostered by its own political party.

"I am in favor of a Farmer-Labor Party composed of workers, farmers, small tradesman, and professional people," Bridges declared. "The workers must have a Farmer-Labor Party to maintain their economic position, to protect the 6-hour day, the 30-hour week, maintain a decent wage scale, keep down prices and otherwise insure a standard of living of health and decency." As a step toward this end, Bridges endorsed the San Francisco Labor Party's mayoralty campaign in 1935, and a year later backed the program of the progressive commonwealth Federation of the Northwest. By 1937, Bridges felt that world events had moved so rapidly that he concluded: "The Farmer-Labor Party is necessary to make democracy work and to prevent the rise of fascism."

It was clear to Bridges that friction between Negro and white, foreign-born and native workers weakened the cause of labor. Discrimination, he told the rank and file, must go. Only by ever widening the base of the labor movement could solidarity, already partially achieved, be reinforced.

After all, he pointed out, the slogan "An injury to one is an injury to all," implied a unity attainable only after the misconceptions of Gompersism have been repudiated. Workers must learn that no matter where labor suffered defeat, whether in Germany or Italy, whether in Alabama or Colorado, the reversal menaced the labor movement everywhere. Fascism meant the end of unions. Fascism meant war, and war bore most heavily on workers, farmers, and their allies. Thus Harry Bridges, who had seen the employers resort to Fascist methods in San Francisco, frankly admitted, "I have tried during the term of my office to have * * * the I. L. A. adopt such policies as will defend the democracy of the world, and oppose the Fascist nations." When a German ship sailed into San Francisco flying the Swastika, the long-shoremen refused to unload the cargo until the Nazi flag was hauled down. Again, during the Italian invasion of Ethiopia, dock workers refused to load war materials on an Italian freighter. While, according to Bridges, "The union was finally forced by the shipowners, with whom the union had a contract, to load this ship * * * our organization intends, in the future, to prevent all war supplies from being shipped to Fascist nations for war on defenseless or democratic people."

We note here that as soon as Harry Bridges advocates the move into the C. I. O. the book immediately gives credit to Bridges, rather than to John L. Lewis, for the formation of the political and economic structure of the C. I. O. There is only one logical inference to such a misstatement. Lewis is not a Communist; therefore, Bridges must be pushed ahead of him.

Note also that Bridges advocates: (a) A Farmer-Labor Party; (b) Negro equality; (c) attack on a neutral country's flag.

Now a new figure enters on the scene in the person of Lundeberg. We are shown how Bridges attempted to gain control of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific and are told:

Bridges seriously misjudged Lundeberg, who proved vain and inordinately jealous of the respect and authority won by Bridges and the militants.

Lundeberg more and more fell under the influence of a group who were the leaders of a small but exceedingly vociferous and unscrupulous band of Trotskyists.

The committee must note the last closely. Who else but members of Communist International would hurl the epithet, "Trotskyist"?

This completes the history of Bridges as given by the Communist Party.

As we have seen from other evidence, the technique of the Communist International is to agitate, infiltrate, propagandize, and form nuclei of militants in order to assume leadership through minority control.

Through evidence already given we are aware that the Seventh Congress of Communist International "changed" the tactical approach of the Communist Party and "ordered" the Communist Party U. S. A. section:

First, to infiltrate the American Federation of Labor.

Second, to increase agitation for Negro equality.

Third, to see that a Farmer-Labor Party was created under its control.

Fourth, to assume command, if possible, of transportation and agriculture.

Fifth, to continue its fight against the Trotskyists.

Sixth, to effectuate a united or people's front.

There is an undeniable parallel between the Communist International instructions to the Communist Party in the United States and the work that Bridges is declared in this book to have done between the time of his arrival and the present date.

Let us re-examine the picture. Bridges, in order to be recognized as a militant, contests the authority of the master of the ship on which he arrives in an American port. He leaves that ship and enters immediately into labor conflict. Having set himself apart by this act, he starts to preach Communist doctrines, urging the working class and particularly the longshoremen to revolt. Those whom he gathers about him are either already members of the Communist Party or soon become so. From the time that he forms this group of militants, with the exception of a few deserters, this same group of militants remains with him as the leadership of the Maritime Federation unions of the Pacific coast. That he used the Communist Party and its tactics is denied neither by the Communist Party nor himself.

We point to the effectual development and actual accomplishment of the general strike in San Francisco under tactics indicated by the

thirteenth plenum of the executive committee of Communist International at Moscow, U. S. S. R.

Nothing can be more important than the statement in this book that Bridges, rather than John L. Lewis, advocated labor's political as well as economic organization.

We find also that Bridges goes beyond the role of a leader of the longshoremen of the Pacific coast, and clearly emphasizes, without further reason, except that it was the order of the Communist International, the need for Negro equality, organization in agriculture, the development of a Farmer-Labor Party, an attack upon Trotskyists, and the development of a United Peoples Front.

The Communists have presented here a clear picture of Harry Bridges as affiliated and working with an organization which has for its avowed purpose the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence. However, they make the mistake of not only showing his affiliation, but also his agitating and leading a force of workers in a general strike, which none other than the Premier of Great Britain declares to be "revolution in the form of force and violence against organized government."

The CHAIRMAN. I want to read a letter into the record at this point, dated February 8, 1938, addressed to Mr. H. R. Bridges, West Coast Regional Director, Committee for Industrial Organization, 593 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.:

DEAR MR. BRIDGES: I have your letter of February 3, 1938, stating that you have been informed that the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Labor has under consideration the holding of a hearing to determine whether or not you should be deported, and requesting that if it is decided that a hearing is to be held you will be furnished with a detailed statement or a bill of particulars of the charges made against you.

Your information that the Department is investigating charges which have been filed with the Immigration and Naturalization Service with regard to your status is correct. In accordance with well-established administrative procedure of the Department, however, no deportation order will be issued until you are given an opportunity to be heard on these charges. Under the administrative practice, the process which is served in advance of the hearing contains in some details the specific charges upon which the proceedings are predicated, so that no person need have any fear of being brought into a formal hearing without having been apprised of the nature of the charges.

With reference to your statement that the demand for hearings was based on trumped-up charges, and evidence obtained through pressure and payment, I can only say that if this is true, you will be given ample opportunity to bring this out at a hearing before the Department takes any final action. Should the Department proceed with hearings, it does not mean that it has adopted the view that the evidence which the complaining witnesses are submitting is necessarily trustworthy. Under the regulations of the Department, the Secretary of Labor makes no findings or expresses no opinion on the deportability of anyone until the transcript of testimony taken at the hearing is submitted to Washington by the examining inspectors.

That is signed by the Secretary.

The letter was written before the *Strecker case* decision, and there seemed to be some doubt, even before the *Strecker case* decision was handed down, whether, or not, they would proceed with the hearings, because the letter states—

Should the Department proceed with hearings, it does not mean that it has adopted the view that the evidence which the complaining witnesses are submitting is necessarily trustworthy.

You may proceed.

Mr. NIMMO. We supplement the history as given hereabove by the following:

During the 1934 general strike Bridges' family was carried on an S. E. R. A. relief rolls, the family residing at that date at 3249½ Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.

In October 1934, he was elected president of the American Federation of Labor trade union committee, which was a Communist organization masquerading as an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor.

December 21, 1934: He spoke at a meeting of the Workmen's Educational Association, a recognized Communist body, at 141 Albion Street, San Francisco, namely, the Equality Hall, in support of the appeal of the Criminal Syndicalism Act.

Bridges was one of the sponsors of the National Unemployment Congress which took place in Washington, D. C., January 5, 6, and 7, 1935.

January 17, 1935: He was nominated for the presidency of the San Francisco Labor Council, but in a vote which took place on January 26, he was defeated by E. Vandeleur, 271 to 60.

February 1, 1935: United States representative Hamilton Fish requested the Secretary of Labor, Miss Perkins, to have the Immigration and Naturalization Service take steps to deport Bridges because of his known affiliation with the Communist Party.

Between February 1 and May 26, 1935, he was active in directing the strikes of the employees of the California and Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation at Crockett, and was endorsed by the Taxi Worker, the Car Worker, and other Communist publications. He was also reported a member of the National Advisory Board of the Communist Party, U. S. A.

April 27, 1935: He was elected member of the presiding committee of the Congress of the American League Against War and Fascism, held at the Building Trades Temple, San Francisco.

July 5, 1935: He spoke at the "bloody Thursday" meeting at Dreamland Auditorium and said:

When it comes to a question of violation of agreements with employers or unity of labor, the agreements must take second place.

July 18, 1934: The San Francisco police, on information concerning Bridges' Communist affiliation, raided the premises at 65 Jackson Street and seized several letters and telegrams, which are now being held by the said San Francisco police in the Hall of Justice in the city of San Francisco.

August 11, 1935: Bridges addressed a meeting of the maritime federation at Dreamland Auditorium, San Francisco, and he asked the question, "Mr. Bridges, are you a Communist?" He replied, "That's one question I always refuse to answer."

August 21, 1935, at a public address Bridges remarked, "I would be surprised if a general strike did not take place soon."

At a meeting on September 10, 1935, of the Friends of the Soviet Union, held under the auspices of the American Radio and Telegraphers' Association in the city of San Francisco, Bridges said:

I have real visions of the Labor Party movement in this country. We want to recruit as many voters as possible so that they can be used as a shield in the coming struggle.

September 22, 1935: At the Civic Auditorium, San Francisco, Bridges addressed the United Labor Party, at which time Ben Legere announced him as the "Symbolization of the Labor Party movement in San Francisco."

September 19, 1935: Bridges was elected delegate to San Francisco Labor Council from Local I. L. A. 38-79.

October 13, 1935: Bridges spoke at 68 Haight Street, San Francisco, at a meeting held by the International Workers' Order, a Communist organization.

He was a member of the arrangements committee for a banquet given for the general district organizer of the Communist Party, William Schneiderman.

October 30, 1935: Bridges spoke at the election rally of the United Labor Party at Dreamland Auditorium, announcing the plans of that party.

January 24, 1936: The San Francisco Call-Bulletin quoted from Bridges' letter to President Roosevelt as follows:

Unless the Government intervenes there will be watched on the Pacific coast a struggle which will inevitably achieve the proportions of a civil war.

February 16, 1936: Bridges was chairman of a meeting in the Dreamland Auditorium, San Francisco, under the auspices of the Modesto Defense Committee.

This was a committee organized to provide defense for the men indicted at Modesto for attempting to dynamite a Standard Oil plant.

THE CHAIRMAN. At this point, let me read into the record a letter in response to a request by Mr. Bonham that United States marshal be assigned to the hearings. This was the time that Mr. Bonham was getting ready and hoping they would have the hearings. The letter is dated April 1, 1938, addressed to the Secretary of Labor, as follows:

MY DEAR MADAM SECRETARY: This acknowledges your letter of March 23, 1938, in which you ask that United States marshals be assigned to assist immigration officers in formal deportation hearings brought against Mr. Harry Bridges, of San Francisco. The hearings, you state, will commence at that city on April 25, 1938, and are likely to be continued in Portland, Seattle, and Los Angeles on later dates.

In reply, you are advised that officers in charge of United States marshals in this Department inform me that, because of pressure of work in the offices of the United States marshals, deputies cannot possibly be spared to assist your Department in this matter. Under the circumstances, I regret to advise you that it will not be possible to assign United States marshals to be present at the deportation proceedings.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. JACKSON,
Acting Attorney General.

This is a letter addressed to Mr. Bonham by Mr. Houghteling, dated April 13, 1938:

R. P. BONHAM, Esq.,

*District Director, Immigration and Naturalization Service,
Seattle, Wash.*

DEAR MR. BONHAM: I recently wrote you in connection with the *Bridges case* about the problem of protecting witnesses. The Secretary has just had a letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, in answer to a letter which I drafted for her signature, stating that it would not be possible to delegate the United States marshals or their deputies to protect our witnesses.

While I am not satisfied with this decision and am planning to visit the Acting Attorney General in person and urge him to cooperate in this matter, I think it is very important that we enlist the aid of the local police to police our hearings and tell their stories without fear or favor.

I will let you know whether a personal argument may prove more successful in getting cooperation from the Department of Justice.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES L. HOUGHTLING, *Commissioner*.

You may proceed.

Mr. NIMMO. The brief continues:

April 18, 1936: Bridges was questioned by Assistant District Attorney August Fortner, relative to a conspiracy murder charge against one Ivan Hunter, secretary of the Seamen's Union of the Pacific.

May 2, 1936: Bridges reapplied for first papers in citizenship.

July 6, 1938: Bridges was reelected president of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, District Council No. 2, Bay Area.

The Western Worker of July 16, 1936, states that Bridges was elected president of the Pacific Coast district, I. L. A.

July 26, 1936: Bridges spoke at a Mooney defense mass meeting, held at the Civic Auditorium, San Francisco.

August 12, 1936: Bridges accompanied John H. Schomaker and Melvin Rathborne, both Communists, to a mass meeting held at Dreamland Auditorium, San Francisco, at which Earl Browder, Communist candidate for President, was the principal speaker.

Western Work, September 24, 1936, states that Bridges was elected vice president, district 10, of the State federation of labor.

October 22, 1936: Western Worker states that Bridges would speak at the King-Ramsey-Conner defense committee on October 23, 1936.

October 27, 1936: San Francisco Examiner states Harry Bridges, district president of the I. L. A., said recently at a meeting at San Pedro:

It is going to be a grand battle if no agreement is reached by October 28. Ship-owners are better off than in 1934, but so are we. We are going to get help. Warehousemen's union in San Francisco alone has 3,600 members and can tie up the city themselves.

November 11, 1936: Bridges said at a meeting at the Dreamland Auditorium, San Francisco:

After this strike is over we will show them more of an inland march.

November 20, 1936: Bridges stated before the San Francisco Labor Council:

We know the troops and machine guns may move in here again, and we know that won't be any fun. But we would rather take a crack at the machine guns than go back to conditions before 1934.

November 23, 1936: Bridges said at the meeting of the Western Writers' Congress in San Francisco:

We are on strike and we are going to win. I hope that the strike will not spread, but it may be necessary. We have not yet called out our reserves in this strike. Before we get through 150,000 or 200,000 workers may be involved.

December 16, 1936: Information was received Ryan had removed Bridges from the I. L. A. executive board.

December 26, 1936: Bridges was booked at the city jail at Long Beach, Calif., for investigation on suspicion of negligent homicide as a result of an automobile accident in which a child was killed.

May 14, 1937: Bridges addressed the University of Washington luncheon group at Seattle, and said:

We take the stand that we who are workers have nothing in common with the employers. We are in a class struggle and we subscribe to the belief that if the employer is not in business his product still will be necessary and we will then be providing them when there is no employing class. We frankly believe that day is coming. We use politicians as long as they benefit the labor movement; and when they don't, we fight them.

May 27, 1937: Bridges was reelected Pacific coast district president of the I. L. A.

June 28, 1937: San Francisco Examiner stated that Bridges declared himself "100 percent C. I. O.," and said, "What are you going to do about it?"

July 14, 1937: It was announced that Bridges was appointed Pacific coast director to coordinate C. I. O. activities.

October 10, 1937: Bridges was ousted as district vice president of the State Federation of Labor.

September 10, 1937: Bridges was sued for \$150,000 for libel and slander in Los Angeles in connection with an asserted interchange of letters between Bridges and one J. P. Hentschel. The complaint stated that Bridges was a member of the Communist Party under the name of Rossi of Brooks.

October 9, 1937: Bridges was quoted as saying that he is not a Communist, but believes in some of the Communist Party principles.

December 5, 1937: Bridges stated in a speech at a Mooney mass meeting: "I personally believe that the Supreme Court of the United States doesn't dare to rule against these two men. I believe that the United States Supreme Court is susceptible to pressure from the public. Let's turn on the pressure. This fight will go on until Mooney and Billings are alongside us on the platform speaking to a ten times' larger crowd."

December 9, 1937: The Voice of the Federation stated: "Bridges, in response to a question asked him by a member of the I. W. W. stated, 'I am a former member of the I. W. W., too.'"

January 3, 1938: Bridges was announced as a sponsor of the Consumers' Union.

January 25, 1938: Bridges sent a telegram to Secretary Perkins as follows: "Attempted enforcement Schmidt decision will tie up port of Los Angeles and involve entire Pacific coast. I. L. W. U., representing over 11,000 of the 12,000 longshoremen on Pacific coast does not intend to allow State courts to overrule majority vote of the membership in choosing its officers and representatives and to override N. L. R. B."

February 2, 1938. Affidavit made by one W. R. A. Patterson states: "Bridges and other leaders concealed from the membership that their advocacy of the C. I. O. was based on the adoption of a policy of the Communist Party, and they concealed from their membership that the change in point of view on the part of Bridges was not due to any personal conviction on his part, but was due exclusively to instructions which he had received from representatives of the Communist Party who had charge of the contacts with Labor Unions in the United States.

Bridges was cited by Judge Ruben Scott of Los Angeles to appear on March 17, 1938, and show cause why he should not be held in contempt of court.

February 15, 1938: Bridges announced that he would ask for final citizenship papers to forestall the move by the Government to deport him as an alien.

April 18, 1938: Bridges was elected president of the I. L. W. U.

June 7, 1938: Bridges at a public mass meeting said: "If visitors are deterred from coming to San Francisco in 1939, it will not be because of labor difficulties, but because of the unjust imprisonment of one of labor's representatives, Tom Mooney.

September 15, 1938: Bridges was fined \$125 on being found guilty of contempt of court for sending telegram to Mrs. Perkins as given under date of January 25, 1938, above.

The committee's attention is called to the items totaling 22, starred with an asterisk. These indicate meetings held under Communist Party leadership or are Communist "party line," statements.

A more detailed history of the activities of Harry Bridges may be had by a complete review of the following exhibits from the maritime brief: 1A, 1B, 1C, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6D, 30A, and 30B. These are the Waterfront Worker, The Western Worker, and the Maritime Worker, respectively.

I would say, in explanation of what I have just read, as indicated in the last paragraph of that date, that subsequently before another judge in Los Angeles County, Bridges was found in contempt of court for having made some comment about Judge Smith's decision.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder if we cannot clear up a few things before you proceed further with the brief. First, I want to read a letter addressed to R. P. Bonham, Seattle, Wash., dated April 15, 1938, and signed by James L. Houghteling. The letter is as follows:

RAPHEAL P. BONHAM, Esq.,

*District Director, Immigration and Naturalization Service,
Seattle, Wash.*

DEAR MR. BONHAM: I am enclosing herewith a copy of a letter which I have just written to District Commissioner Cabill in San Francisco with regard to the *Bridges case*. Most of the information contained therein you know already.

I am considerably worried about this circuit court of appeals decision in the case of *Streecker v. Kessler*, as the decision of the three circuit court judges is very downright and holds flatly that membership in the Communist Party is not of itself a basis for deportation under the 1918 act. Of course we have 10 circuit court of appeals decisions at earlier dates, finding the exact opposite. We are trying to get an opinion from the Attorney General as to the effect of this new decision on our procedure in the *Bridges case*.

Best regards,

Yours sincerely,

JAMES L. HOUGHTELING.

Commissioner.

So it was recognized by the Commissioner, Mr. Houghteling, that 10 circuit court of appeals decisions held that membership in the Communist Party alone was sufficient. Most of those 10 decisions originated in the ninth circuit, in which Harry Bridges resides. Now, is it not a fact that those decisions in the ninth circuit were controlling? In other words, you as a lawyer, know that if you live in the ninth circuit and the circuit court of appeals in that circuit has laid down certain rulings, those rulings will govern the whole situation in that circuit until the Supreme Court rules otherwise: Is that not true?

Mr. NIMMO. The answer to that would be this, normally, yes. The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit having established the

law to its own satisfaction would ordinarily apply its own decision until overruled by the Supreme Court. However, there is this possibility that does exist sometimes that the court will overrule its own decision when it finds there has been a change in the law or sufficient judicial construction by other courts to warrant it; but where the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit has enunciated a doctrine that it has followed so many times, the chances of the court's modifying the doctrine, in the absence of a decision by the Supreme Court, would be almost nothing at all.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to pursue that a little further. In the deportation cases you have a stronger situation, because as the court said in a number of decisions—I will read some of them just briefly—

In *Skeffington v. Katzeff* (277 Fed. 129), the court said:

It has been definitely settled and is not controverted that the decisions of the executive officers charged with the execution of the Deportation Act, if arrived at after a fair hearing and upon substantial evidence and with no abuse of the discretion committed to them by the statute, are final.

There are many other decisions that hold to the same effect.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Turner v. Williams* (194 U. S. 279) held:

And if the judgment of the board—

That is the trial board, before whom the evidence is brought, is it not?

Mr. NIMMO. Correct.

The CHAIRMAN.

And if the judgment of the board and the secretary was that Turner came within the act, as thus construed, we cannot hold as matter of law that there was no evidence on which that conclusion could be rested.

In other words, the Supreme Court virtually held that there was not any ground to reverse the board's decision, if there was any evidence at all to support it.

I will not continue with these decisions. There are many. But the point I want to ask about is this: Is it not a fact, therefore, that if the *Bridges case* had been tried and there had been any evidence introduced that the Communist Party preached the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, that finding would have been conclusive upon the circuit court of appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. NIMMO. It would have, and would have removed the objection in the Circuit Court case.

The CHAIRMAN. They had all of the decisions of the districts in which Bridges resided holding that that evidence alone was sufficient; but if they wanted to remove that danger, all they needed to have done was to produce the evidence in the files that the party was a Communist Party, as in the *Strecker case*; and they could have gone still further and proved the other grounds for deportation; in other words, that he had preached the overthrow of the Government by force and violence or advocated sabotage.

So they were not limited either by the *Strecker case* or the cases in the ninth district; they had other grounds which would clearly have brought this man within the purview of the law, and even

though they might have only slight evidence, that evidence could not have been overruled by the courts.

Mr. NIMMO. I think your analysis is correct; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So you have an entirely different situation in dealing with deportation cases than you have in regular civil or criminal actions?

Mr. NIMMO. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And the reason is clearly explained by the Supreme Court in this decision. Here is a case of *Fong Yue Ting v. U. S.* (149 U. S. 698; 13 Sup. Ct. 1016) Mr. Justice Gray:

In the recent case of *Nishimura Eakin v. U. S.*, 142 U. S. 651, 659, the court, in sustaining the action of the executive department putting in force an act of Congress for the exclusion of aliens, said: "It is an accepted maxim of international law that every sovereign nation has the power, as inherent in sovereignty, and essential to it self preservation, to forbid the entrance of foreigners within its dominions, or to admit them only in such cases and upon such conditions as it may see fit to prescribe" * * *.

In our jurisdiction, it is well settled that the provisions of an act of Congress passed in the exercise of its constitutional authority, on this, as on any other subject, if clear and explicit, must be upheld by the courts, even in contravention of express stipulations in an earlier treaty.

In other words, Congress in dealing with aliens has much more power than in dealing with citizens, and for that reason all that the Department of Labor needed to deport Bridges was any evidence either that he was a Communist, and that the Communist Party was a revolutionary party, or that he himself preached the overthrow of the Government by force and violence or sabotage; is that not a fact?

Mr. NIMMO. That is a fact.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, how can you account for the Secretary's statement in the letter to me, in the light of the facts that have been developed here in their own files—how can you account for her statement that the *Strecker case*, if affirmed, would prevent the deportation of Harry Bridges?

Mr. NIMMO. Well, that would be very difficult to do without speaking very plainly. Of course, it is my view that her attitude must be that of a subterfuge in an effort to protect Bridges, and possibly her ideals are the same as Bridges'. That is the only way I can figure it out.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, going back of that, let us consider this in the light of the fact that here was the immigration officer in charge, Bonham, wiring to the Department and saying that he had this evidence, and that he was prepared to meet the requirement in the *Strecker case*, and then we have a letter back from Mr. Houghteling reprimanding him for his frank opinion. Now, I wish to read a paragraph from the letter dated April 20, 1938, from James L. Houghteling to R. P. Bonham. This letter was in response to the telegram that I have previously read into the record, in which Mr. Bonham said:

Radio News announces your continuance Bridges hearing until Supreme Court decides New Orleans case. I hope this is incorrect as difficult to protect our witnesses indefinitely.

In response to that, Houghteling writes back and says:

Let me say at this point that your ill-judged telegram just received appears to me to deserve prompt and unfavorable comment. When you were in Wash-

ington I drew your attention, in the *Pritchett case*, to the bad judgment shown by local inspectors in trying to impose their own opinions as to the value of certain facts and testimony in problems being handled by the central office. You say in your telegram of this morning that you have made a thorough study of the *Strecker case* and believe the decision not hurtful in the present instance. In making this statement you oppose your judgment to that of the central office and of the Department of Justice, and that on the basis of an imperfect knowledge of all the facts in both the *Strecker case* and the *Bridges case*. This arrogance of judgment and apparent zeal to put your superiors in the wrong is not the cooperation that I have a right to expect from you.

Now, when you consider those facts, and go back and find that even prior to the *Strecker case*, in the letter from the Secretary to Mr. Bridges, she expressed the doubt as to whether hearings would ever be held; and following that line on up, then it presents something that this chair cannot understand, and I thought, as an attorney, you might furnish some light as to any legal justification that might exist on the part of the Department of Labor in refusing to deport Harry Bridges. And I might say that that becomes important when we find that there are other cases similar to the *Bridges case*.

Mr. NIMMO. Well, there is no explanation that I could give, Mr. Chairman, other than that which I have already given. I have read the Strecker decision; I have read the dissenting opinion in that decision by one of the judges of the circuit court of appeals; I have read the statements of other judges in other jurisdictions, and I am satisfied that it has been firmly established in this country that the Communist Party does believe in the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. I do not see how possibly any other conclusion can be reached than that.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, how do you account to the statement of Mr. Houghteling to his Commissioner that his Commissioner was not correctly informed with regard to the facts? Here was the man who got the facts. Here was the man in charge of the case. And here had been submitted the testimony of witnesses. Let us assume that the witnesses were not credible. That was not a matter for the Secretary of Labor to pass upon. It was the Secretary of Labor's duty to proceed with the hearings, promptly.

Now, I would like to ask a few questions. Have you anything else to bring in at this point?

Mr. NIMMO. Of course there is a great deal of material, but it has to do largely with these decisions, and that is ground which has more or less been covered in the Chair's discussion of the matter. I do not think we need go into it except at the end, in the summation.

The CHAIRMAN. That brief is going into the record.

Mr. NIMMO. Mostly it is a discussion of the legal phases involved, and then at the end of the brief we suggest the calling of certain witnesses and reference to certain exhibits. I think that probably closes the brief; would you not think so, Mr. Knowles?

Mr. KNOWLES. I think so; yes.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

THE LAW

We now quote the law under which action on our charges may be brought.

SEDITIONOUS CONSPIRACY

Section 6 of the Criminal Code of the United States says:

"If two or more persons in any State or Territory or in any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, conspire to overthrow, put down or to destroy by force the Government of the United States, or to levy war against them, or to oppose by force the authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any law of the United States, or by force to seize, take, or possess any property of the United States contrary to the authority thereof, they shall each be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than six years, or both" (R. S. 5336).

In this connection it has been held:

"If proscribed, Communists are proscribed because, by advocating the general strike as a political weapon, they are engaged in a conspiracy to overthrow by force or violence the Government of the United States. If the Communist Party is organized for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of the United States by force or violence, it is plainly a criminal conspiracy within the purview of this section. Overt acts in plenty may be found (*Hyde v. U. S.*, 225 U. S. 247, 32 Sup. Ct. 793, 56 L. Ed. 1114, Ann. Cas. 1994A, 614). All its members, citizens or aliens, are subject to indictment and criminal trial. Citizens and aliens thus conspiring should all be hailed into criminal courts and there tried for statutory offense, akin to treason (*Colyer v. Skeffington*, 265 F17).

"And, also, it has been held that the organization known as the Industrial Workers of the World are an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government by force or violence.

"The literature attached to the record is replete with the advocacy of sentiment as above set forth. To 'advocate' means, according to the Standard Dictionary: 'To speak in favor of; defend by argument; one who espouses, defends, or vindicates any cause by argument; a pleader, upholder, as an advocate of the oppressed.' There are several ways by which a person may teach or advocate. It need not be from a public platform, or through personal utterance to individuals or groups, but may be done as well through written communications, personal direction, through the public press, or through any means by which information may be disseminated, or it may be done by the adoption of sentiment expressed or arguments made by others which are distributed to others for their adoption and guidance.

"The testimony shows that Bernat has been a member of the I. W. W. for the last 10 years, and secretary of branch No. 500, Seattle, for some time. His duties as such secretary were to distribute literature, collect dues, handle accounts, and solicit new members. From the activity, as disclosed in the record, the court cannot say there is no evidence upon which to predicate the finding of the commissioner general in each case; and it would appear that the conclusion of the commissioner general, based upon the facts stated, was within the purpose and intent of the Congress, in enacting section 19 of the act February 5, 1917 (ch. 29, 39 Stat. 889; U. S. Comp. St. Art. 4289½ j. j.), and this is emphasized by the passage of the act proved October 16, 1918, entitled: 'An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic or similar classes.' The application for writ will be denied in each case" (Ex parte Bernat, 255 F. 429).

The above shows that if a person is or has been a member of the Communist Party or of the Industrial Workers of the World, an action may be maintained under this statute.

The deportation of an alien under certain conditions is ordered by section 137, title 8, United States Code, as follows:

"*Other aliens excluded.*—In addition to the aliens who are by law otherwise excluded from admission into the United States, the following persons shall also be excluded from admission into the United States:

"(a) Anarchists. Aliens who are anarchists * * *

"(b) Aliens opposed to, or disbelieving in, organized forms of government. Aliens who advise, advocate, or teach, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization, association, society, or group that advises, advocates, or teaches opposition to all organized government. * * *

"(c) Aliens believing in, advising, etc., overthrow, by force or violence, of United States Government, or all forms of law, unlawful assaulting, or killing of any Government officers, unlawful damage, etc., to property, or sabotage. Aliens who believe in, advise, advocate, or teach, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, or teaches (1) the overthrow, by force or violence, of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law or (2) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States, or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character, or (3) the unlawful damage, injury or destruction of property, or (4) sabotage * * *

"(d) Aliens writing, publishing, etc., written or printed matter, advising, etc., opposition to organized forms of government, overthrow, by force or violence, of United States Government or all forms of law, unlawful assaulting or killing of Government officers, unlawful damage, etc., to property, or sabotage. Aliens who write, publish, or cause to be written or published, or who knowingly circulate, distribute, print, or display, or knowingly cause to be circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or who knowingly have in their possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, or display, any written or printed matter, advising, advocating, or teaching, opposition to all organized government, or advising, advocating, or teaching (1) the overthrow, by force or violence, of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law, or (2) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, or (3) the unlawful damage, injury or destruction of property, or (4) sabotage * * *

"(e) Aliens members of, or affiliated with, organization, etc., writing, etc., written or printed matter described in preceding paragraph. Aliens who are members of, or affiliated with, any organization, association, society, or group that writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, or displays, or causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or that has in its possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, issue, or display any written or printed matter of the character described in paragraph (d).

"(f) What constitutes advising, advocacy, teaching, or affiliation: For the purpose of this section, (1) the giving, loaning, or promising of money or anything of value to be used for the advising, advocacy, or teaching of any doctrine above enumerated shall constitute the advising, advocacy, or teaching of such doctrine; and (2) the giving, loaning, or promising of money or anything of value to any organization, association, society, or group of the character above described shall constitute affiliation therewith; but nothing in this paragraph shall be taken as an exclusive definition of advising, advocacy, teaching, or affiliation.

"(g) Deportation. Any alien who, at any time after entering the United States, is found to have been at the time of entry, or to have become thereafter, a member of any one of the classes of aliens enumerated in this section shall, upon the warrant of the Secretary of Labor, be taken into custody and deported in the manner provided in this subchapter. The provisions of this section shall be applicable to the classes of aliens mentioned therein irrespective of the time of their entry into the United States."

(1) "In *Ex parte Pettine* (D. C. Mass. 1919; 259 F. 733), the court said:

"The act of October 16, 1918 (40 Stat. 1012, ch. 186) is comprehensive and emphatic in declaring against all aliens who are anarchists; and, so far as anarchists are concerned, it would seem that no result depends upon varying degrees of anarchy. Indeed, in enumerating the offensive classes, the enactment at once declares generally against aliens who are anarchists, and then, after separating by a semicolon the sweeping declaration against all anarchists from what follows, Congress proceeds to enumerate special classes of offensive aliens, who may or may not be anarchists, such as those who advocate the overthrow of government by force or violence, or who disbelieve in or are opposed to all organized government and who teach assassination of public officials. But these special designations cannot be accepted as in any way detracting from the general enactment against all aliens who are anarchists.

"The act applies itself, not only to aliens who came with offensive theories, but to aliens who have become offensive, and it expressly confers upon the

Secretary of Labor authority to take them into custody, and provides for deportation in the manner provided in the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and this irrespective of the time of their entry into the United States.

"The point is taken by counsel for the petitioners that they are only philosophical anarchists, who do not teach violence. But this point only goes to the degree of offensiveness and cannot be accepted as an answer to the authority of the executive branch of the Government to deport, because, as said in *United States ex rel. Turner v. Williams* (N. Y. 1904; 194 U. S. 279, 294, 24 Sup. Ct. 719, 724, 48 L. ed. 979): 'If the word 'anarchist' should be interpreted as including aliens whose anarchistic views are professed as those of political philosophers, innocent of evil intent, it would follow that Congress was of opinion that the tendency of the general exploitation of such views is so dangerous to the public weal that aliens who hold and advocate them would be undesirable additions to our population, whether permanently or temporarily, whether many or few, and in the light of previous decisions, the act even in this aspect would not be unconstitutional.'

"Congress, through the act approved October 16, 1918, having clearly declared against all aliens who are anarchists, the declaration must be accepted as meaning that Congress was of opinion that the presence of alien anarchists is offensive to our society and dangerous to the Government, and it must be assumed that the enactment in this respect was based upon the idea that the Government possesses the right to determine who shall be members of its community—a right which may be exercised by all nations, and a right which may be exercised both in peace and war."

(2) "An alien resident, who is opposed to the Government of the United States, and who publishes propaganda intended to eventually result in or facilitate its overthrow, has been held to be subject to deportation under the statute, though he does not advocate its immediate overthrow by violence. *U. S. v. Uhl* (C. C. A. N. Y. 1921; 271 F. 676), certiorari denied; *Georgian v. Uhl* (1921; 41 Sup. Ct. 623, 256 U. S. 701, 65 L. ed. 1178).

"And a Spanish alien, who believes and teaches anarchy as a philosophical theory, but does not advocate violence, has been held to be liable to deportation, notwithstanding that he had been a resident in the United States for 15 years. *Lopez v. Howe* (C. C. A. N. Y. 1919; 259 F. 401), appeal dismissed (1920; 41 Sup. Ct. 63, 254 U. S. 613, 65 L. ed. 438).

"Again in *U. S. v. Uhl* (C. C. A. N. Y. 1921; 271 F. 676), certiorari denied; *Georgian v. Uhl* (1921; 41 Sup. Ct. 623, 256 U. S. 701, 65 L. Ed. 1178), it was said:

"'Mere personal abstention from violence, or even from violent language, does not secure immunity, if the result of the gentlest and most guarded speech is to advocate or teach that which the statute condemns. The "philosophic" anarchist is an anarchist nevertheless (*Lopez v. Howe*, N. Y. 1919; 259 F. 401, 170 C. C. A. 377), appeal dismissed (1920; 41 Sup. Ct. 63, 254 U. S. 613, 65 L. ed. 438). Since in this or in any similar case we cannot be concerned with the weight of the evidence, but only with the existence thereof, it is not useful to state or comment upon what *Georgian* was proved to have done, what he admitted having done, or what he himself said of his own teachings, advocacy, or opinions.'

"We express no opinion as to the result upon our minds of the evidence adduced at the deportation hearing, beyond this, viz. there was evidence, indeed it was admitted, that though he did not and does not believe in the immediate overthrow of the Government of the United States that position is not the result of any affection for the same or approval of this Republic, nor of any objection to force and violence per se, but only results from an opinion that the time is not ripe. Ripeness is to be attained by teaching, and by the dissemination of the style of literature which it is his business to circulate; when the time is ripe, it is to be hoped that force and violence will not be necessary, but they will be appropriate as soon as they are likely to prevail.

"However fantastic the above-outlined social program may seem, it is impossible to say that a professed and avowed effort to hasten its consummation is not evidence of that which the statute forbids."

(3) "The Communist Party is an organization which entertains a belief in the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, and membership in that party by an alien at the time of his entry is ground for his deportation (*Ungar v. Seaman*, C. C. A. Minn. 1924; 4 F. (2d) 80).

"And evidence that aliens were members of the Communist Party, and of the purposes and methods of such party, has been held to sustain an order

for their deportation as members of and affiliated with an organization that entertains a belief in, and teaches and advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, within this section (*Antolish v. Paul* (C. C. A. Wis. 1922), 283 F. 957).

"As respects liability to deportation, under this section, as a member of an organization believing in, teaching, or advocating the overthrow by force or violence of the United States Government, a member of the Communist Party, who in his application declared his adherence to the principles and tactics of the party and the Communist International, is bound by the declarations of purposes and program found in the manifesto of the Communist International or in the manifesto and constitution of the Communist Party of America (*Skeffington v. Katzeff* (C. C. A. Mass. 1922), 277 F. 129, reversing *Colyer v. Skeffington* (D. C. 1920), 265 F. 17).

"So the manifesto and program of the Communist Party being of such character as to easily lead a reasonable man to conclude that the purpose of the Communist Party is to accomplish its end, namely, the capture and destruction of the State, as now constituted, by force and violence, it has been held that membership in such party is ground for deportation (*U. S. v. Wallis* (D. C. N. Y. 1920), 268 F. 413).

"And an alien, who admits his membership in the Communist Party and his belief in its principles, must be held to believe in and advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, in accordance with the avowed purposes of that party as set forth in its manifesto and constitution, and is subject to deportation under this section (*U. S. ex rel. Lisafeld v. Smith* (D. C. N. Y. 1924), 2 F. (2d) 90).

"Also, an alien, an admitted member of the Communist Party and similar organizations, possessing for distribution paper of that party and other publications, is subject to deportation (*U. S. ex rel. Vojewovic v. Curran* (C. C. A. N. Y. 1926), 11 F. (2d) 683, certiorari denied; *Vojnovic v. Curran* (1926) 46 Sup. Ct. 633, 271 U. S. 683, 70 L. ed. —).

"Again a denial by a member of the Communist Party of intention to use force or violence for the overthrow of the Government does not prevent deportation of that member, if the program of the party fairly supports a finding that the party advocated the use of force and violence (*U. S. v. Wallis* (D. C. N. Y. 1920), 268 F. 413).

"The question is not one of degrees of imminence of overthrow by force and violence but rather whether that is the ultimate purpose of the organization. *Id.*

"So if the ultimate purpose of an organization is the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, its alien members can be deported, though there is no apparent possibility of such overthrow in the immediate future. *Id.*

(4) "The declarations of purposes and program found in the manifesto of the Communist International, and manifesto and constitution of the Communist Party of America, advocating the disarmament of the armed forces of the existing state, the arming of the laborer, and formation of a Communist army to protect the proletariat, have been held substantial evidence finding that force and violence are necessary instrumentalities for the accomplishment of such purposes, and are contemplated (*Skeffington v. Katzeff* (C. C. A. Mass. 1922), 277 F. 129, reversing *Colyer v. Skeffington* (D. C. 1920), 265 F. 17).

"*Kush v. Davis* (C. C. A. Ill. 1924) 3 F. (2d) 273), the uncontradicted testimony of the Government agent was that when he went to the alien's house the door was open, that he saw a lot of literature upon the table and entered, and that he asked and was granted permission to look at the literature. There was no evidence of any protest either against the entry or the taking of the literature. No demand was ever made for its return, and no objection was made to its introduction or use in evidence. The alien had been in this country 9 years, and that he understood what he was doing was quite evident. He had the literature for the purpose of distribution, for which he was compensated, and he had already distributed considerable of such literature. He had bought and paid for, and had in his possession, organization stamps and stamps for dues in the Communist Party. In his room there were numerous books. On cross-examination by the alien's attorney, the Government's agent was asked: 'Was there anything about most of the other books that you would consider illegal?' A.—Well, he was pretty well posted himself. He told me "those books are legal and those books illegal." He knew the difference between the books himself.' There was held to be abundant evidence to justify the deportation."

"*Ohm v. Perkins* (79 F. (2d) 533): An alien who is a member of the Communist Party which advocates overthrow by force the Government of the United States, or all forms of law may be deported.

"*U. S. ex rel. Kettunen v. Reimer* (79 F. (2d) 315): 'Affiliation' as used in statute authorizing exclusion of aliens affiliated with organizations believing in, advising, advocating, or teaching overthrow of United States Government by force, was held for the purposes of determining whether alien was affiliated with Communist Party, to require showing that alien had so conducted himself as to have brought about status of mutual recognition that he may be relied on to cooperate with Communist Party on fairly permanent basis and not merely that he was in sympathy with its aims or willing to aid it in casual intermittent way.

"*Kjar v. Doak* (61 F. (2d) 566): Revolution presupposes antagonism between government and its nationals, and an alien has no right of revolution against the United States.

"In proceeding to deport an alien Communist it was presumed that organizations affiliated with Communist Party continued to advocate principles, which, according to evidence, they had previously adhered to and documents setting forth program of Communist International for violent overthrow of government were held admissible in proceeding to deport alien Communist, without showing alien's knowledge of program where Communist Party and Communist International were affiliated."

These decisions have uniformly maintained that membership in the Communist Party or the Industrial Workers of the World constituted grounds for the deportation of an alien.

On April 6, 1938, however, the Fifth Circuit, United States District Court of Appeals, held in the case of *Strecker v. Kessler* as follows:

(1) "The evidence, and the only evidence relied on for the finding and order is that during the Presidential campaign of 1932 when one Foster was running as the white, and one Ford as the colored candidate of the Communist Party of America, for President of the United States, appellant, in November 1932 became a member of the Communist Party and accepted certain literature of the Communist Party for distribution. He testified that he was a member of the Communist Party of America until February 1933, when he quit paying his dues, and that since that time he has not been a member. *He did not testify, nor did any one else, that he believed in the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States, neither did he, nor any one else, testify that the organization he had belonged to, the Communist Party of America, taught, advocated, or incited such overthrow.* None of the literature which he was supposed to have circulated in 1932 was introduced, but his book of membership in the Communist Party in the United States was. Not a word in this membership book advocated, incited, or even suggested that the Government of the United States should be overthrown by force or violence. It did teach that the party is the vanguard of the working class; that it incorporates the whole body of experience of the proletarian struggle basing itself upon the revolutionary theory of Marxism, and representing the general and lasting interests of the whole of the working class. The record contained also, offered by the Bureau, extracts from a copy of the Communist dated April 1934: 'Eighth convention issue, a magazine of the theory and practices of Marxism and Leninism published monthly by the Communist Party in the United States of America.' Not a single extract from this magazine referred to the Government of the United States of America directly or indirectly. There is a discussion in it of Austro-Marxism. There is, too, the cynical suggestion that the proletariat should learn the sly ways of the bourgeoisie to become masters of politics and of laws, so that 'legality' instead of 'killing the proletariat,' would 'kill the bourgeoisie,' and the statement that the final overthrow of capitalism could not be accomplished without a mobilization of workers for the struggle against it. There is, too, the general statement that the question of a violent revolution lies at the root of the whole of Marx's teachings, and that only philistines or downright opportunists can talk revolution without violence."

(2) "He testified that he was not an anarchist, that he was not opposed to the United States Government, and that he never knowingly joined an organization the purpose of which was to destroy the Government. All of the literature he received when he joined in November, as he recalled it, was political, such as 'Vote Communist in the November election;' that he never believed in nor taught sabotage, or the killing or assaulting of officers because they were

officers. All that was proven against Strecker was that in 1932 he joined the Communist Party, and that he answered a foolish question: 'Supposing that the majority of the populace of the United States were Communists, and were certain of a victory over capitalism in an armed conflict, would you then personally bear arms against the present Government?'—foolishly, according to its folly—'Certainly; I would be a fool to get myself killed fighting for capitalism.' This proof does not support the finding on which the warrant was based.

(3) "The statute under which these proceedings were instituted was enacted in 1918 and amended in 1920, to meet a situation caused by the crisis in Russia in 1918 and 1919, and the propaganda following that crisis for the overthrow of governments by force. It was enacted to enable the United States to expel from its shores aliens seeking a footing here, to propagandize and proselytize for direct and violent action. The decisions of the circuit courts of appeal in *Skeffington v. Katzev* (277 Fed. 129); *Antolish v. Paul* (283 Fed. 957); *Ungar v. Scaman* (4 Fed. (2d) 8), on the authority of which it was held in *Ex Parte Villurino* (50 Fed. (2d) 582); *Kjar v. Doak* (61 Fed. (2d) 566), upon which the appellee relies here, that membership in the Communist Party of America alone is sufficient to warrant deportation, were rendered upon the Russian experience, and the record of the party at that time. They were all fact cases. They did not, they could not, decide that membership in the Communist Party of America, standing alone, is now sufficient to warrant deportation. The statute makes no such provision. Courts may not write it into the statute.

"Much water, socially and politically, has gone under the bridge since 1920. Russia itself is more vigorously organized than almost any other country in the world, to prohibit and suppress those who teach and preach the overthrow of government by force. In this country, in the Presidential elections of 1932 and of 1936, the Communist Party, seeking by political means rather than by violence, to remake the United States according to its heart's desire, into a government of the proletariat, by the proletariat, and for the proletariat, had a candidate for President. Nothing in our Constitution or our laws forbids the formation of such a party, or persons from joining them. The statute invoked here does not forbid membership in the Communist, or any other party, except one which teaches the overthrow by force and violence, of the Government of the United States."

This decision maintains that:

(a) "A statute providing for deportation of alien who believes in, or advocates, or is a member of an organization which believes in, or advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, does not authorize deportation upon proof alone that in 1932 alien was a member of the Communist Party of America.

(b) "Evidence which showed merely that an alien joined the Communist Party of America and accepted its political literature during the Presidential campaign in November 1932, remaining a member for a few months, but in showing that the alien believed in or taught the overthrow of the United States Government by force, and that he testified that he believed the Government we have at present was the best and that in answer to a hypothetical question as to whether he would personally bear arms against the present Government if a majority of the populace were Communists and were certain of victory over capitalism, that he would be a fool to get himself killed for capitalism, would not support a finding on which warrant of deportation was based that alien believed in or taught the overthrow by force or violence of the United States Government."

On a motion for rehearing in the above matter the motion was denied with Sibley, circuit judge, dissenting:

I think a rehearing should be granted, especially to consider the significance of the references to the Third Communist International contained in the membership book issued to Strecker by the Communist Party of the United States of America and the question whether the objectives and programs of the two named organizations can be judicially noticed. Neither of these things was argued before us nor considered in deciding the case, and they might lead to a different result.

The membership book for which Strecker paid, which was issued in his name, was received and read by him, and on which he paid dues for 2 months and which he retained in his possession after ceasing to pay dues without any resignation or repudiation of his membership, contains these statements: "A

member of the party can be every person * * * who accepts the program and statutes of the Communist International and the Communist Party of the United States of America * * * who subordinates himself to all decisions of the Comintern and of the party * * *." "The Communist Party, like all sections of the Comintern, is built upon the principles of democratic centralization. These principles are * * * immediate and exact applications of the decisions of the executive committee of the Communist International and of the central committee of the party. * * * After a decision has been adopted at the congress of the Comintern * * * it must be carried out unconditionally, even if some of the members of the local organization are not in agreement with the decision." "The party * * * incorporates the whole body of experience of the proletarian struggle, basing itself upon the revolutionary theory of Marxism. * * * The party personifies the unity of proletarian principles, of proletarian will and of proletarian revolutionary action." It thus appears that the Communist Party of the United States of America and its members are affiliated with, nay more, are subject to the Communist International of Moscow and adopt its program and statutes. There is express reference to the "revolutionary theory of Marxism."

Now a court, and equally the Secretary of Labor, may notice without proof what is generally notorious in the community. This does not mean that everyone actually knows it, but that ordinarily well informed persons do. Among such things so noticed are general and local current history. And this includes the organization and objectives of political parties. 23 C. J., Evidence, 1937; *State v. Wright* (251 Mo. 325, 158 S. W. 823); *State v. Kortjohn* (246 Mo. 34, 150 S. W. 1060); *Rider v. County Court* (74 W. Va. 712); *Porter v. Flick* (60 Neb. 773). It is known to me, not from research, but from general information at the time and since, that the Third Communist International was organized just after the World War and in connection with the Russian Revolution as an international organization of those who believe that private property should be abolished and the essentials of wealth and production vested in a government controlled only by the proletariat, and that the accomplishment of this by peaceful means is impractical and that the "direct action" of revolution must be resorted to; and to this end all capitalistic governments must be thus overthrown, and the workers of the world must unite. In the same way I know that the Socialist Party in the United States, which seeks change by constitutional means, was about this time divided, and the "left wing," which insisted on "direct action," separated from it and became the Communist Party of the United States of America and joined the Third Communist International. If this was all knowable by the Secretary, in connection with the evidence in the record, there would be a sufficient basis for him to conclude as a fact that Strecker became a member of or at least affiliated with an organization that advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by violence of the Government of the United States, as one of the capitalistic governments, within the provision of 8 U. S. C. A. 137 (c).

The opinion of this court in fact resorts to judicial notice in its remarks about recent changes in the methods of the Communist Party and in Soviet Russia. But no one professes to know that the Communist Party of the United States of America at that time had. No one doubts that the economic aims of communism may be lawfully promoted by a citizen or an alien in the United States, so long as they are sought to be attained by peaceable means. But the advocacy of attainment by force and violence is outlawed, because laying the foundation for treason. A rehearing ought to be had.

In the original trial, Judge Hutcheson held that in this particular case evidence proving that the Communist Party of the United States of America advocated the use of force or violence to overthrow the United States Government was not presented and he further held, in reviewing previous decisions, that each case must stand on its own facts.

We submit at this time that the contention of the Department of Labor that the case of Harry Bridges rests upon the *Strecker case*, is erroneous and evasive.

We submit that the Department of Labor, in the *Strecker case*, failed to present the necessary evidence, which it had at hand, to sustain its contention and that it can and must cure that defect by an immediate prosecution of the Bridges case. This fact is clearly indicated in the motion for rehearing of the *Strecker case*, where it is suggested that the issues be tried de novo.

We have, in our basic brief, given the evidence which would have proved in the *Strecker case* that the present Communist Party of the United States of America advocates the use of force or violence to overthrow the Government of the United States. This, given in the Bridges case, will cure the first defect.

The second contention, namely, that each case must stand on its own facts, should have persuaded the Department of Labor to proceed at once with the Bridges case.

Strecker testified that he believed in the American system of Government and that when he learned of the true nature of the Communist Party he ceased paying dues. There was no evidence introduced to disprove these facts.

Let us now examine the Bridges case from the standpoint of evidence now in the hands of the Department of Labor exclusive of what we shall hereinafter present.

We find that Bridges is the most powerful symbol of the Communist Party in America as far as trade-unionism is concerned; a person who is not interested in trade-unions as such, but only to use them for the purpose of spreading the subversive doctrine of communism.

We find evidence of affiliation of Harry Bridges with the Communist Party and of his playing the party line in the maritime unions in the strikes of 1934 and 1936.

We find that there was not one deviation from the announced strategy and technique of the party and the actions of Bridges in the development of these strikes.

We find evidence that the case of Bridges does not rest upon passive membership in the Communist Party but upon dynamic leadership.

In the evidence that the Department of Labor has, we find everything that is lacking in the *Strecker case*: a person who is active, sits in the highest councils of the party and is its chief director in the most important phase of the party program; the development of conditions leading to a national general strike and open rebellion.

The Supreme Court of the United States will decide only on the facts of the *Strecker case*, and no matter what its decision is, the decision cannot affect the Bridges case.

Finally, we submit to the committee the fact that Harry Bridges has admitted his membership in the Industrial Workers of the World. We hold that this membership constitutes adequate grounds for deportation and should be included in the charges against him. (See *Ex parte Bernat* (255 F. 431), and *Haywood v. U. S.* (268 F. 795).).

The next question to be considered is that of the development and conduct of a general strike. Does this consist of such acts of force or violence as come within the "seditious conspiracy" statute? Did Congress by the use of the word "force" in the alien statute of October 16, 1918, or in the seditions conspiracy statute, intend thereby to outlaw the general strike?

The only decision rendered is that in the case of *Colyer v. Skeffington* (265 F. 17), which held:

"An organization for the avowed purpose of changing our Government by the use of a general strike is not seeking the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, within act October 16, 1918, even if 'force' as used therein, is not synonymous with 'violence,' since it does not mean force of the religious, moral, political, or economic kind, especially in view of the context, dealing with assassination, destruction of property, and similar kinds of force."

And again—

"I am forced to the conclusion that, if and when Congress is ready to make the general strike unlawful, language plain, apt, and undisguised will be used for that purpose."

This case, however, was reversed in the first circuit, Circuit Court of Appeals, *Skeffington, Immigration Commissioner v. Katzeff et al.*, where it was held:

"We have carefully examined these exhibits for the purpose of ascertaining whether they contain statements which, giving to language its ordinary meaning, would warrant any reasonable mind in reaching the conclusion that the Communist Party teaches or advocates the overthrow by force and violence of this Government as now constituted.

"We think it would be going far afield to say that, from such statements of purpose, no reasonable man could reach the conclusion that force and violence are the necessary instrumentalities for its accomplishment and are contemplated, and that, if consummated, it would overthrow the Government as now instituted. On the contrary, it seems to us that a program which advocates the disarmament of the armed forces of the existing state, the arming of the laborer and the formation of a Communist army to protect the rule of the proletariat, affords substantial evidence that the Communist Party, of which the relators are con-

fessed and avowed members, teaches and advocates the overthrow of Government by force and violence."

In the case of *N. S. F. U. of Great Britain and Ireland v. Reed* (1926 Cr. 536). it was held:

"The general strike is an attack upon the government."

The Premier of Great Britain issued the statement that:

"The general strike is 'revolution' in the form of force and violence against organized government."

We submit that since the time of the *Colyer v. Skeffington case* (June 23, 1920) the major theses of the Communist Party have been developed. That the general strikes of Great Britain and the Pacific coast were practices in class revolution and that one who took part in the leadership of either is guilty of seditious conspiracy. Therefore, it matters not whether Harry Bridges was a member or an affiliate of the Communist Party. He is guilty of seditious conspiracy and can be convicted or deported on these grounds.

We will not at this time present our proof in relation to the charges set forth above. We ask the committee to call the witnesses designated in the appended list, marked "Exhibit No. 4."

At this time we desire to introduce the following exhibits for use in connection with the testimony of the witnesses:

Exhibit No. 4; file, photostatic copies audit by Joseph F. Kehoe of International Longshoremen's Association, Local 38-79 June 25 to October 23, 1937.

Exhibit No. 5; confidential memorandum, September 26, 1934.

Exhibit No. 6; report of National Seamen's Union of Great Britain forwarded to Harry Bridges through Communist International channels.

Exhibit No. 7; Pacific Maritime Worker, June 3, 1938.

Exhibit No. 8; Voice of the Federation, December 9, 1937.

Exhibit No. 9; letter, Z. R. Brown to Rueul Stanfield, June 23, 1938.

Exhibit No. 10; Eternal Vigilance, June 1938.

Exhibit No. 11; New Frontiers, 1937 Year Book.

Finally, we quote from a report received March 23, 1938, when it was believed that the Labor Department was going to conduct a hearing in the Bridges case:

"The present defense plan for Bridges is as follows:

"Aubrey Grossman is personally interviewing prominent people who are liberal in tendencies but are not and never have been closely identified with either the party or any of the united front groups.

"These witnesses will be asked if they have ever heard anything reflecting adversely on Bridges or his character or if they have even seen him at any radical or Communist meetings. Opinion testimony will also be solicited as to whether Bridges should be deported or not. It is their intention to call at least 150, and as this hearing is to be closed and secret, then the Madame can later announce that from a preponderance of the witnesses she is not signing the deportation order. In order to avoid disclosure as to the identity of the witnesses attempts are being made to have these witnesses volunteer rather than testify under subpoena.

"Labor's Non-Partisan League is assisting in assembling these prospective witnesses. Prominent American Federation of Labor men have been approached and Kidwell and Shelly will be two of the defense witnesses."

We shall let the quotation speak for itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Now I want to ask Mr. Knowles some questions.

Mr. Knowles, as a result of the activities of Harry Bridges on the west coast, what has been the outcome from the standpoint of strife or class warfare or economic loss in that situation? What is the true situation out there?

Mr. KNOWLES. Speaking for my own home city, San Francisco. I will say that the water front is almost deserted of shipping at the present time. There have been boats tied up in the upper reaches of the bay and also down the bay, so that the docks are almost a skeleton of their previous activity. And there are now some 6,500 members of the party in the San Francisco area—in the party and their closely allied organizations.

The cost and economic loss has been estimated all the way from \$500,000,000 to \$650,000,000. It has been estimated that if the strike had ended 12 days sooner than it did, the Boulder Dam, the San Francisco Bay project, and the Golden Gate Bridge could be duplicated in cost again. In other words, the cost of those enormous engineering projects would equal only 12 days of the cost of that strike.

And not only that, but its influence has been felt through that whole section of the State. San Francisco is almost a ghost of its former self. Business activity there has moved to other places where there is less discord.

The CHAIRMAN. You are talking about how much money that cost. There is a statement here that to proceed with the deportation of Harry Bridges would just involve, maybe, an unnecessary expense. Some element of economy seemed to have entered into it.

In a memorandum of April 12, 1938, signed by Mr. Shoemaker, he has this to say:

The warrant hearing scheduled to start on the 25th instance will require the expenditure of money and effort, and if the Supreme Court sustains the Circuit Court of Appeals and holds that membership, no matter when, in the Communist Party, is not grounds for deportation, the scheduled hearing in the *Bridges case* would have been to no purpose.

So there seems to have entered into that thing some question of economy with reference to the conduct of these hearings.

I also note in the memorandum dated April 12, 1938, by Mr. Shoemaker, that he has this to say:

It has heretofore been charged that the hearing in the *Bridges case* has been delayed, and yet that charge repeated would not start anything new nor other than the usual charges and statements that have already been made against the Department. The Department is charged with a duty, and should not be unduly influenced by the pressure of public opinion, which clearly might be more vociferous if the Supreme Court should sustain the action of the Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Strucker case* than it would be now if we should defer the hearing.

Mr. KNOWLES. In other words, it is a question of policy.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything else that you can add as to what has happened in that area as a result of this situation?

Mr. KNOWLES. I think that is about all. It is noticeable all through the area, not only in California, but up north.

Mr. NIMMO. There is another feature, I think. That is the fact that for many years there were complete passenger facilities by inter-coastal boats between San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle. Today there is no business of that kind at all. There are no intercoastal passenger boats plying between those ports as formerly. I am not prepared to say, and I do not know what the statistics on the costs will show, but it is the opinion of those on the coast that all of this passenger traffic—which was a very delightful thing, because these boats provided a very pleasant vacation—has all disappeared from the seas.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you agree with Mr. Bonham's statement that delay of this case might or could cause the witnesses to be scattered, and might make it impossible ever to try Harry Bridges?

Mr. KNOWLES. Very definitely.

The CHAIRMAN. Are the witnesses well known?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir; they are all known.

The CHAIRMAN. So that their depositions could be taken?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir. It would be necessary for them to change their names and places of residence, in most cases.

The CHAIRMAN. So that there is a very grave danger that, regardless of what happens in the *Strecker case*, there will be no evidence, and no witnesses will show up at the hearings?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. What phase are you going to take up in the morning, Mr. Knowles?

Mr. KNOWLES. We have, for example, the alien phase, which follows closely on the discussion this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it would be well to take that up tomorrow. I will not be able to be here, but Mr. Starnes will be here, and we will start at 10 o'clock.

The committee will adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Thereupon the subcommittee adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 25, 1938, at 10 a. m.)



INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1938

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., pursuant to adjournment, Hon. Joe Starnes presiding.

Mr. STARNES. The committee will come to order and resume its sessions.

I am authorized by the chairman of the full committee to announce that Homer Martin, who was slated to testify here Wednesday, will appear Thursday of this week, and will give testimony with reference to un-American activities and trade-union movements in the automobile industry.

FURTHER TESTIMONY OF HARPER L. KNOWLES AND RAY E. NIMMO

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Nimmo, will you briefly summarize for the benefit of the committee this morning the matters which you will present and the testimony to be given at this time?

Mr. NIMMO. Mr. Chairman, we would like to proceed with the agricultural brief today. That involves, as I have indicated, a statement of the work of the Communist group and also the maritime unions in connection with the food supplies of the State of California. It will be noted in the brief that at the present time that State produces a very large percentage of both the fresh vegetables and fruit and the canned vegetables and fruit of the entire country.

Now, in view of the exceeding importance of that, we would like to proceed with that brief, and that will merely indicate the infiltration throughout of the Communist group and the maritime group in proceeding to assist in these strikes of agricultural workers.

I do not know that I could summarize it more briefly than that.

Mr. STARNES. You are proceeding along those lines because of the fact that the maritime industry and the agricultural field are your two most important fields out there from an economic standpoint?

Mr. NIMMO. I should say so; yes, sir; and certainly the agricultural field is. We feel that they are more or less interwoven, and this discloses the un-American activities of the group which we have tried to explain at the present time.

Mr. STARNES. All right; you may proceed.

Mr. NIMMO. I would like to say, too, that in presenting this testimony today we will try to follow the procedure which we followed yesterday. We have not been able, in the limited time, to highlight this agricultural brief as we would like; but Mr. Knowles will proceed with it, and it will be understood that what we are presenting is merely a highlight précis of what we will present later by the witnesses at the proper time.

Mr. STARNES. That is correct; you are laying here the groundwork for the detailed exhaustive investigation by the taking of testimony of witnesses on the coast at a later date?

Mr. NIMMO. That is right.

Mr. Knowles has already been sworn, and I would suggest that he start right in with the reading of this brief.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

Mr. KNOWLES. This brief is offered as argument in the specific matter of activity of the Communist Party in California agriculture. The agricultural industry of California has been one of the major focal points for Communist Party attack since 1933.

One of the interesting features has been the great assistance given to the agitators in the agricultural field by the International Longshoremen's Association and the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. We charge that it has been done with the deliberate attempt and purpose of tying up the movement of foodstuffs from rural to urban communities when the time came for the general strike or other types of insurrection. The Communist Party is exceedingly frank in its aims regarding agriculture, as is evidenced by the opening statement made in this brief.

We have nothing to hide. We are merely carrying out the details of a program prescribed by the Communist International to unseat the existing system of government and substitute a control similar in principle and operation to that of Soviet Russia. The workers no longer believe in the advice handed out by William Green, head of the American Federation of Labor, that they should not strike at a crisis because public sentiment would be against them. The longshoremen's strike proves that a crisis is the psychological time to press the issue. That illustrates the reason we follow California crops.

This frank statement of the aims of the Communist Party was made by Albert Hougardy, a Communist leader and his party's candidate for Congress in the Third District of California, in 1934, shortly before his arrest and conviction on criminal syndicalism charges in Sacramento County.

If additional proof is required of what Communists propose to accomplish in California, as a forerunner of their intention to overthrow the Government of the United States, it is significant to note the public utterance of Pat Chambers, guiding force behind many of the agricultural labor disturbances in California:

We will keep on calling strikes among the agricultural workers in California until we get better conditions. Unless we can get settlements very soon, I am afraid it means violence. If the farmers import professional gunmen, as they are now doing, it will be necessary for us to arm and organize in self defense. Of course, we don't want that to happen.

Caroline Decker, as Secretary of the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union, the strike-agitating body of the Communist Party, has been equally unreserved in announcing the plans of her party. In newspaper dispatches of June 1934, which published

the foregoing statements of Hougardy and Chambers, Miss Decker was quoted as stating:

If in the process of getting better living and working conditions, it is necessary for the working class to overthrow the Government, then that means overthrow of the Government.

Chambers and Caroline Decker were also convicted under the California Criminal Syndicalism Act and sentenced to 1 to 14 years in the State Penitentiary. Albert Hougardy was released from San Quentin Prison on parole August 28, 1936; Caroline Decker was paroled on April 17, 1937, and Pat Chambers on October 13, 1937. We offer at this time photos and reports of Albert Hougardy, Pat Chambers, and Caroline Decker, and request that they be marked "Exhibits Nos. 1, 2, and 3" respectively.

Investigation of all agricultural labor difficulties in California in 1933 and 1934 showed that until the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union and its parent, the Trade Union Unity League, sent their agitators into the field, an orderly harvesting of crops was in progress.

A chart seized at Communist Party headquarters in San Francisco during the 1934 raids tabulates the agricultural strikes which took place in California in 1932 and 1933. A notation on the chart states that of 71 total strikes in 1933, 35 were in the agricultural fields involving 50,601 strikers. Of these 35 strikes, the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union, a subsidiary of the Trade Union Unity League (which is the American section of the Profintern or Red International of Labor Unions directed by Moscow), claimed credit for leading 22 strikes, involving 41,650 strikers. We offer at this time photostatic copy of Communist chart showing strikes in agricultural industry in 1932-33, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 4."

A startling expose of Communist activities has been compiled from the Western Worker, official publication of the Communist Party in California, Arizona, and Nevada (District No. 13 of the Communist Party). The chart lists strikes called in California during the period from March 1, 1934, to July 30, 1936, in which Communists participated or gave encouragement. More than 250,000 workers were involved in these strikes, according to the Western Worker. We offer at this time chart showing Communist-aided strikes in California from March 1, 1934, to July 30, 1936, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 5."

The question may be raised as to why California agriculture has been selected as the battleground for the efforts of the Communist Party. The answer is: Because of its vulnerability. Most of the crops are highly perishable in nature and must be harvested and disposed of without delay, or they will become a total loss. California agriculture supplies approximately 40 percent of all the fresh and preserved fruits and vegetables consumed in the United States, and failure of the crops—due to inability to harvest them—would endanger the food supply of the Nation, resulting in widespread suffering and exorbitant prices, thus carrying out the program of the Communist International.

In late 1933 a series of agricultural disturbances occurred in the Imperial Valley.

Imperial Valley's principal source of revenue is from agriculture. Some 400,000 acres are devoted to the production of specialty crops and these chiefly comprise lettuce, melons, tomatoes, peas, carrots, and similar garden crops. This vast acreage is operated in part by owners or lessees of relatively small farms who reside in the valley, and in part by corporations or companies which lease much of the land they farm, hire all labor, and operate with salaried managers and superintendents. The production of the various vegetable crops is for shipment to distant markets. All the crops are highly perishable and must be harvested promptly and shipped to destinations under refrigeration. During the canteloup harvest, the fields must be gone over two and three times a day, as the melons ripen very quickly under the sun. Any interference with harvesting operations through Communist-inspired strikes would bring quick financial ruin upon the grower.

Wage scales paid to field workers, according to official record, were generally in excess of the wage scale justified on the basis of returns to growers. Wage scales are set and payments made prior to the shipping of a crop, so that the wages of any given season cannot be fixed on the basis of the crop returns of that season, as the probable selling price cannot be foretold accurately. The general demand for labor is also a factor in the determining of wage scales.

Imperial Valley possesses a large resident supply of agricultural labor, with Mexicans dominating numerically. Also, there has been a great influx of unemployed from other sections of California, and from many States in the Union, seeking work in the agricultural fields.

On November 1, 1933, a committee representing the Mexican union met with representatives of the growers and agreed, among other things, on a wage scale of 22.5 cents per hour for the harvesting of lettuce. This Mexican union, organized and sponsored by Senor Joaquin Terrazas, Mexican consul to the United States at Calexico, was a stabilizing influence in the agricultural-labor situation and had for a long time maintained most cordial relations with the growers.

During the last few weeks of 1933, however, a marked change began to appear in the attitude of its leaders. During this period representatives of the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union entered the valley and proceeded to organize a local. They drew members from the Mexican Union. The Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union admits in its own printed statements that it is the same organization which led the cotton strike in the Imperial Valley in 1933. It is also by its own admission led by members of the Communist Party.

The official investigating committee sent into the Imperial Valley at the request of the California State Department of Agriculture, the California Farm Bureau Federation, and the agricultural department of the California State Chamber of Commerce, made the following statement regarding the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union:

The Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union is a subsidiary of the Trade Union Unity League. This is stated on its own membership-application cards. The latter organization, in turn, is a subsidiary of the Red International of Labor Unions. This is stated on its literature and there is no attempt at concealment. The R. I. L. U. is an integral part of the world revo-

lutionary movement directed by the Communist International. The directing heads of this movement, and its leaders and organizers in its subsidiaries throughout the world are members of the Communist Party. The program of the Communist Party and of the Communist International embodies the overthrow of the American form of government by force, the suppression of religion, and the establishment of a central control, or dictatorship by the workers themselves. Evidence to support these statements and hence to connect the agricultural disturbances in California with the Communist Party, the Communist International or the world revolutionary movements are so abundant and are becoming so widely known that it seems unnecessary to add them in this report.

We offer at this time pamphlet on The Imperial Valley Farm Labor Situation, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 6."

Its leaders in the Imperial Valley were the same men and women who led the movement elsewhere in southern California. The Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union finally obtained complete control of the Mexican union, which soon after went out of existence.

On January 7, the C. A. W. I. U. circulated notices calling for a strike, and on the following day they presented their demands for increases in wages, recognition of the union, and other concessions.

Between January 7 and January 12 there were minor disturbances at Brawley and other parts of the county. Lettuce was picked by those workers who refused to quit their jobs in spite of picketing and threats of violence. A number, who were not employed, were arrested on charges of disturbing the peace, carrying guns, vagrancy, intent to riot, and holding meetings without police permits.

The only disturbance which threatened to become serious took place on January 12, when the Brawley chief of police and several aides went to the hall used as a meeting place by members of the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union to serve a warrant on two of the union's organizers. The hall was filled, largely with Mexicans, who, it subsequently developed, prevented the arrest of the men sought.

During the turmoil attendant upon the actions of the Mexicans the police chief tossed a gas bomb into the crowd. This incident was seized upon by the radical strike agitators and their sympathizers to support their statements that no order was given by the police chief for the crowd to disperse. It was a moment of confusion and excitement, but witnesses were not lacking who testified that the dispersal order was given.

On January 18 the American Civil Liberties Union, which is closely linked with the Communist movement in the United States, entered the picture in the Imperial Valley. (We offer at this time "Unmasked"—reprint from New York American of October 17, 1935, re American Civil Liberties Union, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 7.") A representative of the American Civil Liberties Union went before the Federal court at San Diego and obtained an injunction restraining the State and Imperial County authorities from interfering with meetings of the American Civil Liberties Union in the Imperial Valley.

The intent of this action, according to the report of the official committee, was to enable the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union to meet under the protection of the A. C. L. U. On January 23 the next incident of note in the valley situation took

place. A. L. Wirin, attorney representing the A. C. L. U., who was scheduled to preside at a meeting, was taken from a Brawley hotel, placed in an automobile, and driven several miles from town, and left to find his way back as best he could. The object was to keep him from attending the meeting scheduled for that evening and to suggest to him that he was "persona non grata" in the Imperial Valley. Wirin was not injured or otherwise molested and made his way back to town.

Shortly afterward, Wirin announced his appointment as chief counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union and proceeded to Washington, dramatically reporting to the United States Attorney General that the Imperial Valley was in a state of insurrection and that the Government should intervene.

The official committee investigating the disturbances in Imperial Valley deplored the Brawley incident that subjected Wirin to a temporary inconvenience at the hands of an exasperated community which regarded him as a disturber of the public peace, but pointed out that the A. C. L. U. had greatly exaggerated the episode.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Knowles, right at that point, is that the same Wirin who is alleged to have sat in at a conference with the witness, Markheim, who made an affidavit that he has sat in at conferences with Harry Bridges?

Mr. KNOWLES. I believe it is, sir. I believe that is the only one by that name. Abraham Lincoln Wirin is the full name.

Other minor incidents took place in various parts of the Valley, but as they contribute little in the way of further understanding of the situation, detailed discussion of them is omitted.

Having failed in their object of fomenting an Imperial Valley strike of major proportions, the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union officials determined upon another and bolder course of action. They issued a circular calling for a Nation-wide boycott on the valley's products. This campaign was wholeheartedly endorsed by the American Civil Liberties Union, who flooded the country with newspaper releases urging an effective boycott. The public, however, declined to become a party to the conspiracy and ignored the plea for a boycott.

From January 23 to February 19, the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union attempted to organize and foment a strike. The citizens of the valley, on the other hand, attempted to prevent them from meeting and from intimidating the workers who were by that time harvesting the pea crop. On February 19 the camp of pea strikers was broken up by the county health officers and 15 hours' notice was given for evacuation, the notice being read in both Spanish and English to all campers.

The conclusions of the official investigating committee were that although constant references were made in the press, in speeches, and various literature to the Imperial Valley "strike," technically there was no strike.

If employees agree to work for a specified wage for their employers and are at work and employers agree to pay the wage and are paying it and there is adequate labor thus employed to do the work, then there is no strike.

The disturbance in the Imperial Valley was brought about solely through the efforts of the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union, with the aid of the American Civil Liberties Union, as

a part of the revolutionary program of the Communist Party. The committee, in its report, declared that the situation was part of what appeared to be a definite program, carried out by the same organization, with the same affiliations and the same leaders and organizers as have appeared in other agricultural areas of the State. It is a program primarily directed toward the perishable crops of California agriculture.

The Communist Party acknowledges its leadership of the Imperial Valley lettuce-pickers strike in a circular issued on January 27. We offer at this time copy of this circular, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 8."

In June 1934 the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union transferred its activities to Brentwood, Contra Costa County, which is the center of the Diablo Valley apricot district. It is interesting to note that the Diablo Valley in 1934 was the only apricot section of the State to produce a full crop. A highly perishable crop, apricots require immediate harvesting.

On June 3, led by Caroline Decker, secretary of the C. A. W. I. U., a fleet of automobiles carrying approximately 250 men and a few women, descended upon Brentwood. Picketing of the orchards began immediately in an effort to halt fruit-picking and packing-plant operations. Threats of violence against the orchard workers were made unless they deserted their jobs. A few workers did leave their jobs, but the greater part remained at work and refused to be intimidated.

Demands were drawn up by leaders of the pickets and presented to the growers. They were promptly rejected by a committee of growers for the excellent reason that no actual employee had raised any objection to the character of his employment or the wage scale.

The threatening attitude of the pickets led to counter measures by the growers. A force of sheriff's deputies, supplemented by members of the California State Highway Patrol, was sent into the district.

On June 6 the Sheriff issued an order forbidding picketing along the highway, and to enforce this order some 75 deputies rounded up the agitators and pickets and quartered them in a corral. After supplying them with lunch, they were escorted to the San Joaquin County line. Fourteen of the ringleaders who resisted the order to cease picketing were arrested under a section of the penal code prohibiting disturbances on the public highway.

The Brentwood district, during the few days of the mass picketing operations, was flooded with inflammatory circulars signed by the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union. Among other statements contained in the circulars was this advice:

All camps elect defense committees and insist on your rights. If any arrests take place, notify International Labor Defense, 645 Twenty-second Street, Oakland, Calif.

We offer at this time handbill headed "Apricot Workers," and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 9."

The International Labor Defense referred to in the circular is the American section of the Communist International Red Aid, and legally aids and propagandizes in behalf of Communists arrested for revolutionary activities. It has numerous branches throughout California and cooperates with the American Civil Liberties Union, 90

percent of whose efforts are also on behalf of the Communist Party and its subsidiaries.

After the ejection from Contra Costa County of the large group of agitators and the jailing of the ringleaders, the district was peaceful and picking of the apricot crop proceeded without molestation from outsiders until June 7, when J. B. Nathan, business agent of the Cannery Workers Union, an A. F. of L. affiliate, appeared upon the scene, formed a committee of five and drew up a list of demands upon the growers.

Nathan's true name is D. M. Gerund. He served a 2-year term for forgery in a Texas penitentiary as No. 56808. The Texas penitentiary authorities released Gerund to the Immigration Department for deportation, upon his statement that he was an alien. When about to be deported, however, he presented proof of his citizenship. He thus succeeded in shortening an indeterminate sentence by committing fraud and perjury. He is reported to have deserted from the United States Army in 1924, and also to have fled from Italy to France to avoid a murder charge. Has a long record of arrests throughout California. Was at one time an organizer for the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union.

Mr. STARNES. May I interrupt at that point, sir? You have a brief here on aliens?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIMMO. We do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STARNES. Do you plan to reach that today? I have certain pertinent excerpts here from the annual report of the State Board of Prisons Terms and Paroles of the State of California, which I would like to make a part of the record. I do not want to do it in this brief if you reach the other brief during the day.

Mr. KNOWLES. That is at your pleasure, sir. It would fit in here, I might say.

Mr. STARNES. In the agricultural disturbances which you have had in the State of California, which you allege were fomented by the Communist Party, do you find a large number of alien workers and alien agitators?

Mr. KNOWLES. A great number of them; yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Do your investigations disclose that many of them have prison records—criminal records?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; quite a number.

Mr. STARNES. At this point I want to make a part of the record certain excerpts from the Fifth Annual Report of the Board of Prison Terms and Paroles of the State of California, page 26, under the subhead, "The Alien Deportation Problem," in which it is called to the attention of the public that deportation of criminals is a Federal function; that it is disclosed that an unusually large number of aliens are held as prisoners for felonies in the State of California; that an unusually small number have been deported, although these specific facts have been called to the attention of the Department of Labor. I am going to supplement that excerpt with an excerpt from the Sixth Annual Report to the Governor of the State of California of the Board of Prison Terms and Paroles for the year 1936-7, and I am going to read this pertinent excerpt on the alien deportation problem:

In our last annual report we called attention to the number of aliens in our prisons and to the difficulty in deporting them, and as deportation is exclusively a Federal matter, we suggested to the Federal Government "that some plan should be arrived at which would provide for the actual deportation of all alien prisoners after they have served the proper time in custody here."

We regret to say that the alien problem is still with us. In fact, on June 30, 1937, we had in our institutions a total of 1,080 admitted aliens as against 961 a year ago. In all probability the actual number of alien prisoners in our institutions was much greater, due to the tendency of foreign-born prisoners to claim that they were born in this country to forestall the possibility of deportation and the difficulty in disproving their claims in many cases. During the period covered by this report we only succeeded in getting the Federal Government to deport 165 men, and of that number 15 went to Canada and 82 to Mexico.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

[From Fifth Annual Report to the Governor of the State of California of the board of prison terms and paroles, 1935-36; pages 26 and 27]

THE ALIEN DEPORTATION PROBLEM

On June 30, 1936, we had in our penal institutions an admitted total of 961 aliens. Due to the tendency of foreign-born prisoners to claim American birth in order to forestall possible deportation proceedings and the difficulty of disproving these claims in many cases, the probability is that the actual number of alien prisoners in our institutions was much greater than the figures given above.

We believe it will be generally conceded that a foreigner who is not sufficiently interested to become a citizen of this country and who violates our laws by committing a felony crime should, after a reasonable period of incarceration, be deported to the country from whence he came. The board believes in this principle and, therefore, makes every effort to secure the deportation of foreign criminals after they have served a reasonable time in our penal institutions. Deportation is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government however, and all the board can do is to recommend to the Federal Government that such prisoners be deported. Unfortunately in a great many cases the Federal Government does not deport these men and the result is that a great many foreign criminals are released from prison at the expiration of their sentences in this country quite possibly to continue their criminal careers here. During the year a total of 133 men were deported. Eighty-nine men, however, went to Mexico and seven to Canada and experience has shown that deportations to adjacent countries are not always permanent for obvious reasons.

Lacking the power to compel deportation, the board makes every effort to induce alien criminals to return to their own countries by granting paroles upon condition that the inmates leave the United States and, in many cases, even offers to pay the inmates transportation to the countries from whence they came. However, we find in most cases that such inmates prefer to serve their entire sentence inside of prison walls rather than accept paroles to their own country.

We respectfully suggest to the Federal Government that some plan should be arrived at which would enable the actual deportation of all alien prisoners after they have served the proper time in custody here.

[From Sixth Annual Report to the Governor of the State of California of the board of prison terms and paroles, 1936-37, p. 13]

THE ALIEN DEPORTATION PROBLEM

In our last annual report, we called attention to the number of aliens in our prisons and to the difficulty of deporting them, and as deportation is exclusively a Federal matter, we suggested to the Federal Government "that some plan should be arrived at which would provide for the actual deportation of all alien prisoners after they have served the proper time in custody here."

We regret to say that the alien problem is still with us. In fact on June 30, 1937, we had in our institutions a total of 1,080 admitted aliens as against 961 a year ago. In all probability the actual number of alien prisoners in our institutions was much greater due to the tendency of foreign-born prisoners to claim that they were born in this country to forestall the possibility of de-

portation and the difficulty in disproving their claims in many cases. During the period covered by this report we only succeeded in getting the Federal Government to deport 165 men, and of that number 15 went to Canada and 82 to Mexico.

Mr. STARNES. That is for the purpose, of course, of showing that there is an unusually large alien criminal population in the country; that the State of California has that problem; that the officer of the State board of prison terms and paroles has dealt with the problem, made a study of it, and requested the Federal Government to take action, and has requested the Federal Government to deport aliens, as required by law, who are convicted of felonies and crimes involving moral turpitude, and that no such action has been taken except in a limited number of cases.

All right, Mr. Knowles, you may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLES. The committee consisted of Leo Murphy, chairman; W. C. Ham; Jack Rea; J. B. Nathan; and Caroline Decker. No member of the committee was a resident of the Brentwood district.

On June 9, 1934, the Brentwood area was the center of a widespread distribution of mimeographed leaflets which bore this sentence at the bottom of the sheet in capital letters:

"THIS LEAFLET ISSUED BY THE CANNERY & AGRICULTURAL WORKERS INDUSTRIAL UNION"

The leaflet called for a strike and mass picketing operations, and presumably was written and distributed under the direction of Caroline Decker, secretary of the C. A. W. I. U. (We again refer to exhibit No. 9, handbill headed "Apricot workers.")

The larger apricot orchards in the Brentwood area lost no workers in the strike agitation, but a few pickers left their jobs in some of the smaller orchards, and a few growers made wage concessions as a conciliatory move in order to facilitate picking of the crop. The labor supply at Brentwood was more than ample to conduct harvesting and cutting operations. In fact, it was estimated that there were three applicants for every available job.

On June 15, Nathan was arrested at Brentwood on complaint of C. B. Weeks, who charged that Nathan had made threats against the lives of workers in the Balfour-Guthrie orchards. Nathan was released on \$1,000 bail. Previously he had been twice arrested at Brentwood on charges of trespassing and disturbing the peace. He was fined \$350 on the latter charge.

A Methodist ministerial group conducted an inquiry into the Brentwood situation and reached the conclusion that "the chief agents in fomenting trouble in the Brentwood section are Communists." The committee of ministers was appointed at the annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, then in session at Stockton. Members of the committee were: Dr. B. J. Morris, Berkeley, chairman; Dr. C. C. McCown, dean of the Pacific School of Religion; and Rev. A. G. McVay, of Orland. We offer at this time a clipping from the Oakland Tribune of June 19, 1934, captioned "Pastors Lay Fruit Strike to Radicals," and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 10."

Also, clipping from the San Francisco Examiner of June 5, 1934, captioned "'Reds' Renew Valley Strike," with the request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 11."

It is known that Communists were in the district selling membership cards for anything down and the balance when possible. Cards were in some instances secured for 25 cents deposit. This activity was under the direction of Caroline Decker.

Following dismissal of the charges against Nathan, he left the area, and harvesting of the crops proceeded peacefully as the majority of the agitators—finding there was no hope of fomenting a strike—also left the vicinity.

This labor agitation has been deliberately planned by the Communist Party to destroy agricultural wealth by delaying the harvest of perishable crops and to plant the seeds of revolution and the overthrow of the Government by force and violence in the minds of the laborers. It has been stated that each strike is but a rehearsal of the revolution. When workers have resisted the efforts of agitators to lure them away from their jobs, acts of sabotage have been resorted to. Sabotage operations assume the form of attacks against properties of the fruit-preserving industry and fruit-drying plants.

Phosphorus gangs have been active in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys where many of the important fruit canning and drying plants are located. On July 7, 1934, fruit-packing plants were destroyed by phosphorus bombs at Hanford and Cutler, and attempts were made several days later to destroy plants at Tracy and Modesto, which fortunately were unsuccessful.

"Strike Strategy in the Agricultural Fields" was the title of a circular widely distributed from San Jose headquarters of the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union. It is significant that nowhere in the pamphlet was any reference made to the fundamental causes of strikes, such as wages and living and working conditions. We offer at this time copy of this pamphlet, *Strike Strategy in the Agricultural Fields*, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 12."

The bulletin makes clear the revolutionary intent, as one paragraph states:

Considerable experience in revolutionary struggle and in strike strategy has been developed. With greater and greater masses of workers constantly being drawn into the struggle, the time has come to take stock of the various methods and tactics used in preparing and conducting strikes of field workers.

The anonymous writer of the bulletin admits that the ultimate objective of a series of strikes is "to bring about the establishment of the workers' own government."

Three general methods of calling strikes are discussed in the bulletin: The open method, the quiet—or "delegates' conference" method, and the combination "open and quiet" method. The open method, it is explained, is handled by the union, which "calls a public mass meeting of workers to consider the question of calling a strike."

"If the sentiment of the majority is in favor of striking," the leaflet continues, "the strike call is issued, a strike committee is elected from the floor and instructions issued in regard to picketing, etc." The open method was held objectionable in the leaflet because it prevented preliminary work, exposes the leaders before the strike materializes, and gives the "bosses" a chance to organize to prevent the strike or minimize its menace.

The "delegates' conference" method is more secret, and more favored by the radical strategists. Full plans are formulated at a

secret executive conference of workers, "and when the strike is called it comes as a surprise to the bosses and police."

"Whenever possible, union men should be working on the ranches as much more effective work can be done from the inside than from the outside." This is the well-known Communist technique of "boring from within"—in other words, enlisting the sympathies of men already at work.

The combination method is achieved by holding of secret executive conferences of workers to formulate plans of action, and then the holding of a mass meeting on the eve of the strike.

Workers' schools are also maintained throughout California by the Communist Party, where young men and women are taught all the arts of communism, its doctrines of violence, terror, destruction and strategy in fomenting strikes and spreading discontent and disorder. By means of strikes and preventing the harvesting and transportation of perishable crops, it is their hope to completely paralyze California agriculture.

Proof that the communists do not seek to win the strikes they foment, but only to bring about as much misery as possible, lies in the following excerpt from an address by Ralph H. Taylor, executive secretary of the Agricultural Council of California, in an address before the Commonwealth Club on June 8, 1934; we offer at this time pamphlet entitled "California's Embattled Farmers," and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 13."

A personal friend, a man of admittedly liberal views, who by many is considered a radical, was so considered by the members of the Communist Party who were active in the San Joaquin Valley cotton strike last year (1933). As a result, two of these leaders, who were then being sought by the police, called on this man and put in several hours with him, discussing their aims and problems. After considerable discussion with reference to the strike then in progress, my friend asked these Communist leaders what they were planning to do after they won the strike. Their reply was significant. It was:

"We do not want to win this or any other strike. We want to create all the misery we can by all the means we can, for in that way we hope to more quickly bring about revolution."

This is not some ingenious figment of the imagination. This is a case within my own personal knowledge, for which I can vouch.

On July 19, 1934, the California Legionnaire published:

The central committee of the Communist Party, New York City, has assigned John Cameron, chairman southern California branch Communist Party, to organize strikes throughout the agricultural districts of California. Field and agricultural workers, through a campaign of propaganda, intimidation and violence, will if possible, be led to quit their jobs. All communists recently arrested in San Francisco and vicinity will be ordered to report for instructions in either Marysville, San Jose, Sacramento, Fresno, or Bakersfield. Communists from these cities and their vicinity will be ordered to report for duty in San Francisco. Activity will be concentrated on crops that must be harvested, canned, or preserved rapidly, and upon canneries, drying and packing sheds. Phosphorus squads are now organized headed by workers who have graduated from eastern communist schools. A reign of terror is planned. Wherever possible, blame for sabotage, intimidation and violence is to be placed upon the American Federation of Labor, in order that public opinion be aroused against the A. F. of L. The American Legion is to be involved wherever possible and widespread reports given to "police brutality," "Fascist tactics," and "vigilante methods."

We offer at this time copy of "California Legionnaire," published on July 19, 1934, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 14."

Mr. STARNES. In other words, the agricultural workers in the agricultural fields of California were organized for the purpose of dumping and destroying the agricultural products by the use of phosphorus bombs, and so forth.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; there was a great series of cannery fires there.

In August and September of 1934 a strike of major proportions appeared imminent in the lettuce area of the Salinas and Pajaro Valleys. The Western Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, published inflammatory articles which called attention to the ineffectiveness of arbitration as a means of winning strikes, following the acceptance of arbitration by the principal parties to the controversy: The Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association and the Vegetable Packers' Association.

Ella Winter, so-called high-priestess of communism on the Pacific coast, wife of the late Lincoln Steffons, and author of many books on communism, attempted to gain admittance to a hall in Salinas where members of the union were holding a mass meeting. Communist literature was generally distributed to the Filipino camps and to members of the Vegetable Packers Association. Advantages of membership in the Cannery, and Agricultural Workers' Industrial Union was also stressed in this literature.

In this instance the plans of the Communist Party and the C. A. W. I. U. were of no avail, and a satisfactory settlement was effected.

We now offer a reprint from the January 30, 1936, issue of the Western Worker, entitled "Tasks of the Communist Party Among California Farmers," and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 15." The article states, in part:

Our section committees and units have three tasks of major importance. First they must establish locals of the A. F. L. Agricultural Workers Unions wherever possible. * * *

Second, organized progressive groups must be built up around party members in locals of the Grange, Farm Bureau, or Farmers' Union. * * *

Third, serious attention must be given to the trade unions in the small communities. Often these bodies are not so bureaucratically controlled as they are in the larger cities.

This is but another link on the chain of evidence of the Communist Party's interest in destroying California agriculture.

Early in 1936, bloody rioting in the vegetable fields near Los Angeles marked the culmination of Communist agitation which had been going on for several weeks. Three men were shot and seriously wounded, three were stabbed and four others terribly beaten when the Sheriff's squad arrived to stop the battle in the Dominguez hills. They arrested 35 men and a woman radical, two other women agitators escaping in the melee.

This labor trouble was agitated by the Communist Party under the name of "Public Works' Unemployed Union, Local 49," and was directed against the vegetable growers who had refused to recognize the union. Lillian Monroe, secretary of the union, has a long record of Communist activity, particularly in the San Joaquin cotton strike of 1933, which resulted in two deaths and injuries to scores of others.

Led by members of the Young Communist League and represen-

tatives of the radical America Student Union, several cars of high school students attempted to "rush" strikebreakers in the fields near Venice on May 9th and incite rioting. Peace officers arrival on the scene prevented serious consequences.

Other student Communists worked in half-day shifts in the fields adjacent to Los Angeles, the boys and girls walking arm in arm with Mexican laborers who patrolled the section where strikebreakers were at work.

In connection with this strike in the celery fields, the plan of strike tactics mapped out by Communist leaders included the use of "flying squads." The "flying squad" was composed of a number of carloads of agitators. The leading car carried men who were armed and were under orders to shoot at the workers as they sped by the field; this car and its armed "reds" then disappeared as quickly as possible. Additional cars then stopped at the field and created as much disturbance as possible, although none of the agitators were found to carry arms during a search. The Communist Party has ordered the use of the flying squads in agricultural strikes in California whenever possible.

We offer at this time a stenographic report dealing exclusively with the so-called "California Conference of Agricultural Workers" held at Stockton on June 6 and 7, 1936, and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 16."

Sponsors of this agricultural conference included such authentic dirt farmers as Israel Feinberg, Sam White, and H. Rubinstein of the radical International Ladies Garment Workers' Union.

Mr. STARNES. Do you mean to say that the sponsors of the agricultural organizations during this agricultural strike included such people as Israel Feinberg, Sam White, and Rubinstein, who were members of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Who is Mr. Jesse Southwick, mentioned here?

Mr. KNOWLES. He is connected with the Motion Picture Projectors' Union.

Mr. STARNES. Who is Kidwell?

Mr. KNOWLES. He is connected with the Bakery Wagon Drivers' Union as a sponsor.

Mr. STARNES. And who is Patterson?

Mr. KNOWLES. He is in the Workers' Alliance; also, Norman Thomas, Socialist candidate for President, is one of the sponsors.

Mr. STARNES. Are any of these men known to be Communists or aliens?

Mr. KNOWLES. I would hesitate to call them that, from memory.

Mr. STARNES. I would like to know about Caroline Decker. Is she the same Caroline Decker who was very active in the Pittsburgh area in 1932?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right; under the name of Caroline Johnson.

Mr. STARNES. Jack Johnson is her husband?

Mr. KNOWLES. He was.

Mr. STARNES. He is a Communist?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Is he the same party who organized the Bombay textile strike in 1898, when he was deported by the British Government?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. As to these leaders in the agricultural strike known to have prison records or known to be aliens or members of the Communist Party, or any other un-American group, will you furnish as exhibits to your agricultural brief, sketches of the persons referred to?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; I will be glad to do that.

Mr. STARNES. It is interesting to note in this connection that while Congress has placed its stamp of disapproval on the importation of strikebreakers, that the industrialists and employers have been brought, under the leadership of the Communist Party and their work in trade-union activities, into the very evils which have been complained of on the part of the workers in this country, and I think rightly so, and we find them indulging in identically the same tactics. I think that is a matter worthy of note and more than passing attention that they have, according to your sworn statement, that you will further amplify with testimony—that they, themselves, have imported strikers from the East and have imported agitators from other groups in nowise connected with the activities of agriculture, but who have been guilty of violence, murder, and the destruction of private property.

Mr. NIMMO. There can be no doubt about that.

Mr. STARNES. That is worthy of note and worthy of attention.

If it is wrong for one side, and it is necessary to have Federal legislation to correct those evils—and I think so, because I voted for those acts—I think it is worthy of attention on the part of Congress and the people of the United States so that a general remedy for those conditions may be secured.

Mr. NIMMO. There can be no doubt about the necessity for legislation to correct some of these conditions, but that can be supplemented by better and stronger enforcement of the legislation we already have.

Mr. STARNES. I agree with you on that.

You may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLES. As I said, sponsors of this agricultural conference included such authentic dirt farmers as Israel Feinberg, Sam White, and H. Rubenstein of the radical International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; Jesse Southwick of the Motion Picture Projectors' Union; George Kidwell of the Bakery Wagon Drivers' Union; and E. D. Patterson of the Workers' Alliance; honorable chairman was Norman Thomas, Socialist candidate for President of the United States. The entire meeting was dominated by the radical element, although a few bona fide agricultural representatives were drawn in, believing it to be a legitimate movement.

At this conference was adopted a resolution to form a Federation of Agricultural, Cannery, and Packing Workers, and also to make a demand for a minimum wage of \$3 per day. California farmers, as shown by official Government records, are already paying the highest wages for farm labor in the United States. They are deter-

mined to keep up this high standard, but to pay more than they can afford would spell ruin for both farmers and workers.

In September of 1936, a major strike occurred in the lettuce fields of Salinas and Watsonville. This strike was under the guidance of the Communist Party. It was marked by numerous incidents of violence; trucks of lettuce were overturned when growers attempted to move their crops to market without the assistance of strikers; tomatoes studded with razor blades were hurled at drivers of trucks; the streets were strewn with glass.

The International Labor Defense promptly appeared upon the scene when such outstanding agitators as Luella "Happy" Branham and Louis Masterson were arrested for their activity in connection with the strike. Elaine Black, secretary of the I. L. D. in northern California and one of the most ardent and militant Communist agitators on the Pacific coast, personally moved into the Salinas area to direct defense proceedings, and while there addressed the apple workers of Watsonville, urging them to strike in sympathy with the lettuce workers.

The organizational chairman for the Fruit and Vegetable Workers' Union was one Glenn Kircher, also known as George Kircher, G. Kercher and Kersher, as well as Paul Roberts and other aliases.

At the time of the strike in Salinas, as well as being organizational chairman of the union, Kircher was also county organizer of Monterey County for the Communist Party. Police records show that he was sentenced to 5 years in the Federal Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., on the charges of stealing Government property, and for 1 to 5 years in the Idaho Penitentiary for burglary, besides arrests as a short-change artist in Concordia, Kans.

In a letter to "Comrade" W. W. Fennell in Long Beach, Kircher wrote as follows:

Things are going hot and heavy here now. Our new agreement is under fire, and plenty of it. The local press has gone nuts. We have a complete R. & F. committee doing the talking. Louise Faris, Shorty Elston, Ben Montgomery, Ann Fritz, and Bud Faris. Doss and Shevlin are small potatoes now. Delegates to State convention this year are S. Elston, Louise Faris, and myself. * * * Everything points to a clean sweep in O. C. T. Got a good strong branch in San Jose now. One in Placerville, and one in Keseyville, all wrap packers. Will have the field workers sewed up in another week. Sending you a copy of the F. and V. W. U. Bulletin. Shorty, Louise Montgomery, Ethel Elcorn, and myself are the editorial staff. Sure is one fine job being editor of two papers. * * * This year has been all haywire jobs run 2 and 3 days a week. All the tramps should be on relief, but they have not got that much sense. They still believe they are aristocrats. * * * The gang says to tell you the lettuce workers could stand a contribution.

Kircher signed his letter "Comradely" and advised Fennell to, "P. S.—address all mail to—Paul Roberts, Box 738, Salinas, Calif."

The rioting was so severe in the counties of Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito that the law enforcement officers of the State, county, and city organized a joint operating force, and finally, in Monterey County the "Posse Comitatus" statute was invoked and the entire manpower of the county placed at the disposal of the sheriff.

Communist members of the Fruit and Vegetable Workers' Union have openly boasted of the part they took in inciting the trouble and in keeping it stirred up. Copies of the Western Worker were freely distributed.

We offer at this time The American Citizen, October 16, 1936, article captioned "Reds Still Active in Salinas," and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 17."

On November 23, 1936, a strike was called in the San Joaquin celery fields led by Vance E. Ambrose (true name Earl V. Ambrose) as president of the Agricultural Workers' Union at Stockton. Ambrose has a police record and he is an extremely active member of the Communist Party, having held the office of section organizer in San Bernardino County, literature agent, and other posts. In spite of the declaration of "strike" by some 350 newly recruited members of the Agricultural Workers' Union, most of whom were not employed by the celery growers or shippers at the time the strike was called, some 3,000 others refused to join the movement and continued working. Harvesting and shipping continued without interruption.

Herbert Hoover, alias Herbert Howard, field organizer for the Communist Party for the cannery and agricultural workers, organizer of the communistic Ex-service Men's League, and a member of the International Labor Defense, was also active in agitating for a strike.

At first the union fee demanded by Ambrose and his cohorts was \$25, but this was gradually reduced until last quotations valued the membership fee at \$2.50, to be paid if and when the candidate had the money.

We introduce at this time two dodgers, "To the General Public," and request that they be marked "Exhibits 18 and 19," respectively.

Over 100 delegates from 23 States, representing 100,000 agricultural, cannery, fruit, and vegetable workers, attended the First National Convention of the U. C. A. P. A. W. A. (United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing & Allied Workers of America) at Denver, Colo., on July 9, 10, 11, and 12, 1937.

The United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing & Allied Workers of America, with the direct backing of the C. I. O. leadership, had now set out to organize California's cannery and agricultural industry.

The convention call, issued by the National Committee of Cannery, Agricultural, Cannery, and Packinghouse Unions, with Donald Henderson as secretary, was signed by 54 unions representing 75,000 workers. Of the 54 unions, it was claimed that 44 were A. F. L. affiliates and 10 independent unions.

Donald Henderson, who was elected international president of the U. C. A. P. A. W. A., was formerly a professor of economics at Columbia University and was ousted in 1933 due to his radical activities. He is a member of the Communist Party and the American League Against War and Fascism (now known as the American League for Peace and Democracy), a subsidiary of the Communist Party, United States of America, and is active in numerous other radical and left-wing organizations. He has been active in developing the Arkansas Sharecroppers Union, and more recently, in January 1938, he directed the pecan-shellers' strike at San Antonio, Tex.

The U. C. A. P. A. W. A. convention at Denver passed a number of resolutions, indicating very clearly their stand. The following resolutions were adopted:

Resolution regarding establishment of an international union covering the following fields: All types of agricultural workers; all fruit, fish, and vegetable canning and packing workers; all horticultural workers and workers in allied fields.

Resolution endorsing the organization, program and policies, and activities of the Committee for Industrial Organization and recommending application to C. I. O. for an international charter covering their field of work.

Resolution going on record against race discrimination in all its forms; further pledging convention to uphold fundamental of no discrimination toward foreign-born and other minorities, regardless of nationality, color, creed, or political belief; and condemning reactionary practice by relief authorities discriminating against foreign-born and other minorities; further, to fight for the extension of franchise to all American citizens, particularly the Negro people, and to all peoples not yet extended that right.

Resolution endorsing formation, by Government aid or otherwise, of genuine cooperatives.

Resolution favoring cooperation of U. C. A. P. A. W. A. with the Workers' Alliance of America (which the Communist Party boast they organized and control); further, that a subcommittee be elected to work with a subcommittee of the national executive board of the Workers' Alliance of America on the details of cooperation.

Resolution supporting all bona fide union labels.

Resolution regarding establishing of a union label to be used on products handled by any branch of the U. C. A. P. A. W. A.

Resolution instructing executive committee to design a uniform dress button for all members, to be on sale at all locals.

Resolution regarding labor's political role: Endorsing and supporting such progressive prolabor movements as the Farmer Labor Party of Minnesota; the Progressive Party of Wisconsin; the Commonwealth Federation of the Pacific Northwest; the American Labor Party in New York; Labor's Nonpartisan League; and in several sections, the Democratic Party.

Resolution that convention give its whole-hearted support to the Spanish Loyalist government, demanding the immediate withdrawal of all German and Italian troops from Spanish soil, and petitioning the United States Government to enact an immediate and complete war materials embargo on both Germany and Italy as aggressor nations in an international war.

Resolution instructing executive board to aid in every possible way all labor prisoners through their respective defense committees.

Resolution requesting that a bureau for agricultural workers be established as a part of the United States Department of Labor.

Resolution protesting use of troops in strikebreaking activity.

Resolution demanding immediate dismissal of nine Filipino strike leaders in Hawaii, and expressing gratitude of the convention to the International Labor Defense for sending Attorney Grover Johnson (a consistent defender of Communists and other radicals) to defend the arrested leaders.

Resolution protesting the dismissal of Jerome Davis, professor at Yale University and president of the American Federation of Teachers, because of his liberal social opinions and activities.

Resolution against war and fascism.

Resolution requesting removal of discriminations, exclusions, and exemptions of agricultural workers from all existing Federal and State legislation.

Resolution demanding that when assistance or subsidies to farmers are given by the Federal Government, that a minimum wage for farm labor and a minimum-hour clause be included before such assistance can be given, and endorsing the administration's Soil Conservation Act.

Resolution protesting amendments to Wagner Act which would establish employer control over unions in their plants.

Resolution condemning child labor.

Resolution supporting President Roosevelt's plan for re-forming the Supreme Court.

Resolution favoring immediate reinstating of workers to W. P. A. projects, who have been laid off during canning and agricultural seasons, and that in no case shall W. P. A. workers or relief workers be taken to lower wages in seasonal work or flood the labor field at the cost of taking jobs from other people.

Resolution condemning false and misleading advertising for workers, and urging that prevailing wage, living conditions, and whether or not labor troubles exist, be included in any advertising for farm workers; further petitioning State governments to abolish labor contractors and encourage the maintenance of hiring halls by unions.

Resolution definitely opposing incorporation of trade-unions.

Resolution urging passage of American Youth Act in Congress, as approved and adopted by the Fourth American Youth Congress, and further petitioning Congress to expand facilities and appropriation of the N. Y. A.

Resolution demanding legislation covering occupational diseases.

Resolution demanding Federal and State agencies to protect and enforce the right of free speech and assembly, and urging repeal of antipicketing and criminal syndicalism laws.

Resolution opposing the Sheppard-Hill bill.

Resolution supporting an amended Gavagan antilynching bill.

Resolution commending La Follette committee and insisting on its continuance with an increased appropriation.

Resolution on world peace.

Resolution to wire greetings to Puyallup, Wash., fruit cannery workers, out on strike.

Resolution asking United States Department of Labor to gather authoritative material on wage rates and working conditions of those workers employed in agricultural and canning industries.

Resolution commending Farm Research, Inc., of Washington, D. C., and requesting them to continue serving U. C. A. P. A. W. A. national headquarters, local unions and districts with statistical and research studies in the future.

We offer at this time Facts for Farmers, published by Farm Research, Inc., and request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 20."

Mr. STARNES. I want to call attention to one thing. I notice there was a resolution adopted against war and fascism, but I notice there was no resolution against war and communism; that is very interesting.

Mr. KNOWLES. That is very definitely so; you will never find that.

Mr. STARNES. You will find a similar trend running through the warp and woof of these radical organizations referred to during these hearings, that there are resolutions adopted against war and fascism but no resolutions adopted against war and principles of a communistic type or character. I think that is very noteworthy.

You may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLES. An official list of Communist delegates present at this first convention of the U. C. A. P. A. W. A. is attached hereto, and we request that it be marked "Exhibit No. 21."

Locals which have been chartered in district No. 2 of U. C. A. P. A. W. A. (district No. 2 comprising California, Arizona, and Hawaii), are located as follows:

Local 3, Dairy Workers Union, 406 South Main Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

Local 5, Alaska Cannery Workers Union, 32 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Local 11, Cannery Workers Union, 72 North Second Street, San Jose, Calif.

Local 12, Agricultural Workers Union, Marysville.

Local 14, Cannery and Preserve Workers Union, 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Local 15, Cannery Workers Union, 936 Broadway, Oakland, Calif.

Local 18, Cannery and Agricultural Union, box 1427, Salinas, Calif.

Local 20, Cannery and Agricultural Union, 42 North Center Street, Stockton, Calif.

Local 22, Cannery and Agricultural Union, 531 East Meta Street, Ventura, Calif.

Local 23, Cannery & Agricultural Union (Camarillo), 531 East Meta Street, Ventura, Calif.

Local 24, Cannery and Agricultural Union, route 1, box 26, Chowchilla, Calif.

Local 26, Cannery and Agricultural Union, Eleventh Street Store, Yuma, Ariz.

Local 29, Cannery and Agricultural Union, 204 East Fourth Street, Santa Ana, Calif.

Local 30, Cannery and Agricultural Union (Yuma County) box 375, San Jose, Calif.

Local 32, Cannery and Agricultural Union, box 525, Watsonville, Calif.

Local 33, Cannery and Agricultural Union, 622 Eye Street, Sacramento, Calif.

Local 36, Cannery and Agricultural Union, box 431, Mountain View, Calif.

Local 42, Cannery and Agricultural Union (Bakersfield), Box 741, Delano, Calif.

Local 44, Cannery and Agricultural Union, 909 Webster Street, Redlands, Calif.

Local 49, Cannery & Agricultural Union, Post Office box 698, Hynes, Calif.

Local 58, Cannery and Agricultural Union (Modesto), box 226, Riverbank, Calif.

Local 64, United Fish Cannery Workers, route 1, box, 526, National City, Calif.

Local 68, Cannery and Agricultural Union, 639 Twentieth Street, Richmond, Calif.

Local 69, Cannery and Agricultural Union, box 848, Santa Maria, Calif.

Local 71, Field Workers Union, 300 West Ocean Street, Lompoc, Calif.

Local 72, Field Workers Union, box 932, Pismo Beach, Calif.

Local 76, Cannery and Agricultural Union (Hawaii), box 76, Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii.

Local 78, Wrap Packers and Shed Helpers of California, care of L. D. McMillan, general delivery, Santa Maria, Calif.

Local 79, Cannery and Agricultural Union, 1921 Indio Street, San Diego, Calif.

Local 73, Fish, Cannery and Reduction Workers, 650½ Ocean View Avenue, Monterey, Calif.

Local 203, 215 North Sacramento Street, Lodi, Calif.

Local 233, care of Olaf Olson, Labor Temple, Pittsburg, Calif.

Applications for charters have been made by the following unions:

Field Workers Union, Santa Clara County, Mountain View, Calif.

Filipino Independent Labor Union, care of Chris Mensalves, box 932, Pismo Beach, Calif. (Pismo Beach, Guadalupe and Lompoc).

Cucom (Mexican Independent), postoffice box 218, Westminster, Calif.

International officers were elected on the third day of the U. C. A. P. A. W. A. convention. Donald Henderson, whose record has been previously mentioned herein, was unanimously elected president. J. R. Butler, of Arkansas, was unanimously elected vice president, and Conrad Espe, president of the Northwest Council of the Cannery, Packing House, and Agricultural Workers, placed in the same category as Harry Bridges, of the Maritime Federation, and Harold Pritchett, alien Communist from Canada, who is president of the Woodworkers' Federation, by Delegate Harry Olson, who nominated him, was elected secretary-treasurer.

The international executive board of the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America, as elected at the first convention, is composed of the following members:

F. J. Martinez, Grand Island, Nebr.; John Koontz, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Alfredo Fajardo, Seattle, Wash.; Merrill Jackson, Austin, Ind.; O. H. Whitfield, East Prairie, Mo.; Leif Dahl, Bridgeton, N. J.; Chris Mensalves, Los Angeles, Calif.; Alfred Boolean, Santa Ana, Calif.; E. A. Kope, Los Angeles, Calif.; Odis Sweden, Muskogee, Okla.; James Sager, Lorado, Tex.; H. J. Mitchell, Memphis, Tenn.; George Woolf, San Francisco, Calif.; Lloyd Lehman, San Jose, Calif.; Conrad Espe, Seattle, Wash.; Donald Henderson, Trenton, N. J.; J. R. Butler, Memphis, Tenn., and Arkansas; Walker Martin, Birmingham, Ala.; J. L. Moore, Olympia, Wash.; Edward Norman, Orlando, Fla.; Harry Olsen, Seattle, Wash.; Paul Arias, Fort Lupton, Colo.

Among organizations and individuals sending greetings and messages of support of the convention were radical Congressmen Jerry J. O'Connell, John T. Bernard, and Maury Maverick; the American Civil Liberties Union; International Labor Defense; Workers' Defense League; National Negro Congress; and the Workers' Alliance.

We offer at this time the following exhibits, and request that they be marked as indicated.

Exhibit No. 22: "The C. I. O. and the Farmers."

Exhibit No. 23: "An Explanation."

Exhibit No. 24: "Farm Union Research Agency."

Exhibit No. 25: "Report of Meeting," June 25, 1938.

April 1937 was marked by another Communist attempt to seize control of California's vast canning industry in the San Joaquin Valley area, which was described by the press as a "bloody civil war." Typical Communist tactics marked the "strike," which was actually a lockout of a majority of regular workers who wanted to work and resented the interference of the "strike committee" by a majority of cannery hands and applicants for jobs, led by Communist agitators. Vance Ambrose again took a leading role in this situation as chairman of the "strike committee."

Picket lines of strikers, directed by the "red" ringleaders and reinforced by Harry Bridges' longshoremen—Bridges has also expressed interest in organizing the agricultural workers in California—surrounded the five plants involved in the "strike," refusing to allow the workers to enter the plants. It is reported that 300 longshoremen left their jobs on the Stockton waterfront and hurried to the canneries to strengthen the picket lines.

Farmers of San Joaquin County, driving their own trucks and hauling their own produce in an attempt to fulfill their contracts with the canneries, were attacked by the "strikers" and a riot ensued. The outbreak has been characterized as one of the most violent in the history of California's agricultural labor wars.

It is a matter of record that the majority of the cannery workers did not want to strike. Many of them went to the State Capitol at Sacramento and petitioned the Governor to protect them in their right to work. Some 600 workers, distrusting the radical leadership in Stockton, went to Modesto, seeking the aid of the Stanislaus Labor Council to organize an independent union free of Communist influence.

An agreement was finally reached whereby the canneries recognized the Cannery Workers Union and Vance Ambrose was eliminated from the picture.

At this time we introduce the following exhibits, and request that they be marked as indicated.

Exhibit No. 26: "An Open Message."

Exhibit No. 27: "Attention!"

Exhibit No. 28: "Attention Strikers."

Exhibit No. 29: "Strikers Attention."

Exhibit No. 30: "It is Still Happening Here."

Exhibit No. 31: "Stockton."

Exhibit No. 32: "We Shall Never Forget."

Throughout every farming area in California the Communists have penetrated, preaching their insidious doctrines of hate and destruction. In every part of California they have urged workers to join the Communist Party. They have stated that "if you join with us we will get you higher wages and better working conditions," and they have repeatedly declared that the "capitalists" should be driven out, in order that the land might be turned over to the workers.

The Communists have sought to unite all agricultural workers in this State into one big union, which would encompass more than 200,000 men and women. In this way they could then halt the grow-

ing and harvesting of crops. They could bring about a famine of fresh fruits and vegetables throughout the Nation.

The picture, taken as a whole, does not appear to involve urban residents. But the Communists have the vision to see that agriculture forms the keystone of the arch that supports the foundation of all America. If they can crack that keystone by ruining the farmers of California, then the destruction of the arch may be easy and they will be well on the way to a bloody revolution.

MR. STARNES. Do you wish to summarize, briefly, for the record, Mr. Nimmo?

MR. NIMMO. I think I would like to do that, if the committee will permit me.

MR. STARNES. We will be glad to have you do that.

MR. NIMMO. Mr. Chairman, this will be understood to be a statement of my own conclusions, as I draw them, in line with what has been prepared in this brief, with much of which I have not been familiar until the last few days, and also from my personal experience in California.

You can bear in mind that California is a big State; it is very long, and narrow in proportion to its length. In the State there is a tremendous amount of desert or waste area, where nothing but sagebrush and cactus grows.

But in the central portion of the State, there is a great fertile section in the Sacramento section, extending for several hundred miles north and south, a section in the Salinas Valley where there is a very prolific area, near Salinas in Monterey County, where they grow extraordinary crops of lettuce, where the crop is one of the finest in the world. At one time that one valley was practically supplying the entire United States with the lettuce that they can grow in that section.

In the southern part of the State, we have a thoroughly distinctly arid country, just like western Texas as compared with eastern Texas. We have there in the Imperial Valley what is a distinct desert region. There are places where it has been said the rain never falls, but with irrigation they can produce the finest crops in the world. The Imperial Valley, since it has been irrigated, produces as fine a crop of fruit as can be found anywhere else.

What I am trying to emphasize is this, that because of the extraordinary heat in some of these sections—and it is not what we might call the eastern humid heat, it is direct heat, with a dehydrated sort of weather, and when that strikes the crop that crop has to be taken out of the ground, or has to be harvested very quickly.

Therefore, those particular crops, such as, we will say, the melons, are peculiarly susceptible to difficulty unless they are taken right away. They have got to be taken during a certain hour of the day in some instances. They cannot be left out there any longer, even a fraction of the day, in some instances, for the purpose of being shipped to the market under ice.

Now, with those peculiar conditions, of course, there has developed in the state a kind of labor that is necessary for that purpose.

I think the statement is correct that the highest wages in the United States are paid to agricultural workers there. They are a necessity. And I think the standard among the laborers upon the farms and the workers—the standards of wages and of living

conditions are just as good as or better than you can find almost any place in the United States.

With those conditions confronting the State, and having in mind that California does produce 40 percent of the Nation's supply of fresh vegetables and of canned vegetables—those statistics, of course, I have to rely on, but they are gathered by other people; but that is my understanding—but with that tremendous stock of food dependent upon the ability of the farmers to harvest it and to market it, it is an exceedingly serious thing when a situation arises such as this.

And I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I am impressed more with the danger of this situation that is covered in this brief this morning than I am almost anything else, because that strikes at the Nation's food supply.

That would be my summary, as you have suggested. Do you desire us to proceed any further this morning?

Mr. STARNES. It is also charged in this brief that outside influences have come in there and fomented trouble, organized these people, and pulled these strikes; is that correct?

Mr. NIMMO. Oh, that is my interpretation of the brief. Of course, this brief is gathered, as I said, from many sources. But the only interpretation you can put on it is this, that these communistic influences, most of them originating outside of the State, are concentrated upon a vital spot. And then, in connection with it, we have the absurd picture of Bridges' Maritime Workers delivering a gang down there to carry out or to picket in an agricultural strike.

Mr. STARNES. And the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union taking an interest in it?

Mr. NIMMO. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. That is what I wanted to bring out; that is, that it is not an objection to strikes, or a fight against strikes as such, or the right of labor to strike; but you are calling attention to the fact that with reference to these seasonal crops that you have mentioned in your brief, there have been no legitimate strikes. That is, the allegation is that there have been no legitimate strikes. The contention is that a majority of those people who are working there were, in fact, opposed to the strike.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And the strikes that you had with the attendant violence to persons and to property, were fomented by outside influences, by people who had no direct connection whatsoever with agriculture or the agricultural workers. I just wanted to have that clear for the record.

Mr. NIMMO. I think that is the correct interpretation of it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STARNES. Were there ever any strikes among agricultural workers, or any serious difficulties in this area, prior to the advent of the communism in that area?

Mr. KNOWLES. Oh, yes; there have been labor disputes; there have been other labor disputes than those mentioned that were distinctly labor disputes. We have indicated those in which Communist influences were apparent.

Mr. STARNES. But you did not have any general strike or any widespread violence out there until the advent of communism?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. And what you would call un-American activities in connection with the trade-union movement?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right. We are not indicating the labor controversy, but merely the Communist attachment to it.

Mr. NIMMO. Mr. Chairman, I thought that we could proceed with this brief on youth. In my judgment that is important because it enters into the effect of the Communist activity upon the mind of the young people in the formative stage.

Mr. STARNES. You may proceed with that.

Mr. KNOWLES. This brief presents certain facts relating to the activity of the Communist Party in various youth organizations on the Pacific coast.

It is supported by documentary evidence which it is believed is sufficient to establish a controlling point.

AMERICAN STUDENT UNION

Most of the subversive activities among the youth of the United States were formerly conducted through so-called student groups, one of these being the National Student League (Communist) and another the Students League for Industrial Democracy (Socialist). The former group was organized in 1932, the other having been organized in 1905 as the Intercollegiate Social Society, which was sponsored by the revolutionary writer, Jack London. While considerable rivalry existed between these two groups they were, in conformity with orders issued at the July 1935 World Communist Congress held in Moscow, merged in that year into a group which is now known as the American Student Union, which was not only sponsored by the Communist Party but to all intents and purposes is entirely controlled by it.

To this American Student Union may be credited the continuous agitation for and promotion of the students' so-called peace strikes, which occur on the campii of universities throughout the United States in April of each year. These peace demonstrations concern themselves with many subjects which are not germane to the administration of our educational institutions, and as an indication of this condition attention is directed to exhibit No. 1, issued by the executive committee of the American Student Union of Stanford University under date, April 13, 1937, and particularly to that portion in which objection is raised to a speaker selected, on the grounds that he openly supported the so-called Spanish Fascists.

In connection with this same exhibit it will be noted that the American Student Union is conjoined with the youth section of the American League against War and Fascism, with the American Youth Congress, with the youth section of the Emergency Peace Committee, and with the War Resisters League. All of these organizations are notoriously communistic. Ostensibly the principal objective of the American Student Union is to oppose compulsory military training, but both directly and through the American Student Union's support of the American Youth Congress this student

group concerns itself and attempts to exercise its influence in matters of politics, labor, religion, etc.

Exhibit No. 2 is a circular issued by the American Student Union of Berkeley opposing the antipicketing ordinance effective in that city and which contains the statement:

The International Longshoremen's Association and the American Student Union have joined together today to picket Woolworth's, outstanding on the Central Labor Council's unfair list, in order to inaugurate a campaign for the repeal of this ordinance.

The next exhibit, No. 3, is a circular issued jointly by the American Student Union and the Warehousemen's Union 38-44 of the I. L. A. It will be noted that 20 members of the union and 18 students of the university were arrested for violation of the antipicketing ordinance, and exhibit No. 4 is a circular advertising the holding of a trial of 14 of the students so arrested.

The Communist leaders of the A. S. U. were drafted into service by the Communist leaders of the Longshoremen's Association for the definite purpose of creating a more favorable public sentiment toward the latter. Viewing it, however, from the standpoint of inroads which the party has made in the student movement and ignoring the nature of the offenses for which these students were arrested, the facts nevertheless provide a specific instance of a definite tie-in between the American Student Union movement and radical labor leaders.

A circular issued by the American Student Union on April 16, 1936, advertises an open meeting of that body to be addressed by Henry Schmidt, Communist official of the International Longshoremen's Association, whose subject was Importance of the Water Front in the Anti-War Fight. (Exhibit No. 5.)

Indicative further of the effectiveness of Communist proselyting among the students at California universities, there are presented two typical cases of students at the University of California at Los Angeles.

1. Nancy Bedford-Jones, a former student at U. C. L. A., and a member of the erstwhile Student League for Industrial Democracy, was arrested in October 1933 while speaking at a street meeting of the Young People's Socialist League in Los Angeles. This young woman is the daughter of Bedford-Jones, the author. Their political differences of opinion—and her repudiation of her father were aired in one of our national magazines. In November 1935 Nancy Bedford-Jones was married at Yuma, Ariz., to Joseph P. Lash, national secretary of the American Student Union, and nationally known as a Communist.

Nancy Bedford-Jones next appeared, according to Sunday Worker of May 16, 1937, as secretary of the United Youth Committee to Aid Spanish Defense, a typical illustration of the indoctrination which occurs in our institutions of learning.

2. Celeste Strack. This young woman was a former member on the debating team of the University of California at Los Angeles and was suspended on October 29, 1934, by the provost of the university because of her communistic activities, following which she made a speaking tour of California colleges agitating "students' rights." At the opening of the 1935 semester Miss Strack was reinstated, following which she was an active participant in the Nation-wide student peace strike set for April 12 of that year.

On or about July 1, Miss Strack was appointed a member of a committee to investigate Fascist activities in Cuba; was deported from

that country and shortly after her arrival and on August 17 was arrested on a charge of disorderly conduct while picketing the office of the American Mercury Magazine in New York City. Subsequently she was elected general organizer of California for the American Student Union. The San Francisco Examiner of December 30, 1935, announced her election at the convention of the A. S. U. at Columbus, Ohio, on December 28 and 29, to the position of national secretary of the high-school section of the American Student Union. Another product of proselyting within our educational domains.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, among the activities of the American Students Youth was the active championing of the warehousemen's strike on the Pacific coast?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. And later propagandizing the student bodies of the respective schools, and the people, on aid to the Spanish democracy?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir; also its endeavor to have the compulsory Reserve Officers' Training Corps disbanded in those schools.

Mr. STARNES. Proceed.

AMERICAN YOUTH CONGRESS

Mr. KNOWLES. As further evidence of the tie-in between the Youth movement and the Communist Party, there is presented exhibit No. 6, "Proceedings of the Northern California Regional Youth Congress" (American Youth Congress), and the attention of the committee is directed to the following: This meeting was under the chairmanship of Gus Brown, a known Communist, and the nominating committee included Millie Goldberg, of the Young Peoples' Socialist League, and Jack Olsen, of the Young Communist League. The continuations committee includes the following known Socialists and Communists: Gus Brown, Communist; Richard Criley, Communist; Newell Johnson, Communist; David G. Lyon, Communist; H. Norbeck, Socialist.

Among those who extended greetings to the Youth Congress were: Senator Culbert L. Olson, who has been discussed in the "political" section of this report; Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn, of the San Francisco School of Socialist Studies, a communistic organization; George Woolf, Communist president of the Ship Scalpers' Union; John D. Shomaker, Communist officer of International Longshoremen's Association; and Caroline Decker, who was at that time in the State penitentiary for violation of the State criminal syndicalism act.

Her name is mentioned in the agricultural brief.

Only two other greetings were extended and these were by radical members of the California State Assembly. A large number of the delegates were long past the age when they would properly come within the youth classification, but they nevertheless affiliated with the Youth Congress for the purpose of infiltration and the spreading of subversive propaganda.

On page 2 of this exhibit it is stated that the American Youth Congress was one of six organizations sponsoring the national student strike on April 12, 1935, and that the Congress would probably be the one organization through which all others would cooperate.

It is believed that the tie-in between the American Student Union and the American Youth Congress has been fully established.

Exhibit No. 7 is a call for a northern California conference of the American Youth Congress, which was held at 68 Haight Street, San Francisco, then a notoriously known meeting hall for Communist groups.

Exhibit No. 8, which is an invitation for a meeting of the American Youth Congress held in San Francisco on November 17, 1935, states on page 3 that the Congress drafted the American Youth Act, which was introduced at a subsequent national legislative session.

At a meeting of the southern California council of the American Youth Congress held in 1935, that unit of the Congress definitely positioned itself on the following measures:

1. Opposition to antipicketing ordinances.
2. The abolition of the criminal syndicalism act.
3. The repeal of anti-handbill ordinances.
4. Condemning the Los Angeles "red squad."
5. For so-called academic freedom at U. S. L. A.
6. Favoring the freedom of Tom Mooney, the Scottsboro boys, and all other so-called class prisoners.
7. Opposition to American participation in the Olympic Games at Berlin.
8. Support of student strike against war.
9. Support of maritime workers.
10. For the abolition of compulsory military training.

In directing the attention of the committee to the foregoing it is believed that the action taken by the southern California council is so highly typical of the attitude of the Communist Party in its various activities that an additional connection between the party and the congress is definitely established.

MODEL YOUTH LEGISLATURE

In keeping with the instructions of Moscow that the Communists must broaden their field and work through other channels, there was held in Milwaukee, Wis., a Youth Model Congress in conjunction with the convention of the Fourth American Youth Congress. At this meeting plans were formulated to hold model State legislatures throughout the United States, and at the first annual convention of the Young Communist League of California, held in Los Angeles on November 5, 6, and 7, support for a State youth legislature was reenacted in the following resolution:

That the league support the Church Youth Council and the Y. W. C. A. toward the establishment of a State youth legislature and that the State committee (Young Communist League) be instructed to draft bills for this legislature, and that the league build the survey movement.

That this model youth legislature had the full support of the Communist Party and the Young Communist League is evidenced by the publicity accorded this movement in the Western Worker of November 11, 1937, and Daily Worker of July 5, 6, and 7, 1937.

In keeping with the action taken by the southern California council of the Young Communist League, there was issued a State-wide call to a conference in San Francisco on May 6, 7, and 8, 1938, to be known as the California Youth Model Legislature. Prior to issuing this call the support of many civic and religious leaders whose integrity and patriotism is above suspicion was solicited and in many instances successfully so because of its altruistic appeal. True, there are a scattering of Communists among the list of sponsors,

but they were completely overshadowed by the inclusion of many respectable citizens and business leaders who were innocent dupes. Several of those upon learning of the nature of the conference advised the Youth Model Legislature to withdraw their names, but the circulars had been issued and it was too late to carry out these requests. Not only were the business leaders duped, but the mayor of San Francisco set aside the Civic Auditorium for a 3-day period for this youth conference, announcement of which is given in exhibit No. 9.

The program of the conference is submitted and marked as "Exhibit No. 10" and the attention of the committee is here directed to a partial list of Communist organization advertizers who made the printing of the programs possible by advertising:

The Tom Mooney defense committee, King-Ramsey-Connor mass meeting, International Book Shop, the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, the Peoples World, I. L. W. U. 1-6 (longshoremens), Workers' Alliance, Labors Non-Partisan League.

Submitted herewith is a partial list of delegates who registered for this Youth Legislature, among whom are the following:

James Lerner, general secretary, youth section, American League for Peace and Democracy; Helen Morton, national secretary, National Student Union of the Y. W. C. A.; A. Clayton Powell, Jr., pastor, Abyssinian Baptist Church; Joseph P. Lash, secretary, American Student Union; Roland Elliott, executive secretary, National Student Union; Gilbert Green, national secretary, Young Communist League; John Lewis, president, Young People's League, United Synagogues of America; Hayes Beall, president, National Council of Methodist Youth; Martin Harvey, president, Christian Youth Council of North America.

Gene Dunn, Young Communist League of Los Angeles; Dorothy Zadow, Young Communist League of Los Angeles; T. Nagle Templar, chairman, continuation committee, Youth Conference of Los Angeles; Jeri Steep, executive members of Continuation Youth Conference of Los Angeles; Hans Hoffman, Los Angeles Junior College "National Student Union;" Constance Eby, Youth Section to Aid Spain, of Los Angeles, and Young Communist League; Jean Muir Newman, Religious Youth Committee of Los Angeles but a C. P. member; Roberta Fisher, American Student Union, Los Angeles; Sherman Milinkoff, American Student Union, Los Angeles; Mary Reuter, industrial department of the Y. W. C. A. of Denver, Colo.; Annie E. Gray, Denver section of the Communist Party but representing the Denver youth.

Virginia Walker, Y. W. C. A., University of Denver; Helen Rappaport, Young Communist League of Denver; Selda Long, president of the Y. W. C. A. student group of the University of California; Marie Casper, executive chairman of the Educational Department of Catholic Youth of Los Angeles; Claudia Williams, of the San Francisco Y. W. C. A. Professional Women's Department; Anna Beachman, Y. W. C. A., Oakland; Richard L. Criley, of the San Francisco Young Communist League, and Communist Party; George Hitchcock, editorial staff of the People's World and Labor Herald; James O'Neil, director of publicity of the C. I. O. Northern California Department (a member of the C. P.); Dorothy Gray, northern California Youth Section "Negroes," Oakland; Avon Carl-

son, San Luis Obispo Section of the Communist Party, and president, Future Farmers of America; Thomas Papich, president of the San Francisco State College branch of the National Student Union and Communist Party member.

Mariano Hermoso, chairman, executive committee of the Filipino section of the Young Communist League of San Francisco.

As a further indication of the tie-in between Communist politicians, between certain political officeholders and Communist-affiliated groups, the attention of the committee is directed to the following resolution which was introduced at the State Assembly of California the early part of 1938 by Assemblyman Ellis E. Patterson (heretofore referred to in the "Political" section of this report), urging the official recognition of the State assemblymen to the California Youth Model Legislature:

Whereas the young people of today, like the rest of our population, are faced with serious and perplexing problems; and

Whereas in keeping with the traditions of our country and as evidence of the vitality of our democracy, the young people themselves are coming together to seek, through cooperative endeavor, a solution of these problems and a clarification of these perplexities; and

Whereas the future of our democracy rests in the hands of a generation which is alive to the responsibilities which democratic government involves and well versed in its mechanics; and

Whereas the California Youth Model Legislature is an organization for bringing together all sections of our youth for the purpose of interchanging ideas, for sharing problems and discussions of problems, for examining the workings of our legislative system, for providing practical experience and participation in the forms of government by which youth's problems must ultimately be solved, and for placing before the legislature those bills which are considered of vital importance; and

Whereas this organization has been endorsed by representative community groups in all parts of the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the speaker is hereby requested to appoint an assembly interim committee of five members, to be known as the Assembly California Youth Model Legislature interim committee, to counsel, advise, and cooperate with the California Youth Model Legislature in legislative problems and practice.

Resolved, That this body permit the young men and women elected as delegates the use of this assembly chamber once a year for a meeting place as done in the State of New York.

The foregoing resolution did not secure sufficient votes in the assembly to make it effective.

Exhibit No. 11 is a handbill issued by the Young Communist League advertising a mass meeting under the auspices of the Northern California Youth Congress in behalf of Angelo Herndon. Here again establishes a tie-in between the Youth Congress and the Communist Party.

There is next presented a handbill issued by the Young Communist League in which a report is made on the National American Youth Congress held in Washington, D. C., on January 3, 1935, and the attention of the committee is directed to the fact that this handbill announced that the full text and complete list of resolutions adopted at the Youth Congress were obtainable at the Workers' Book Shop, 37 Grove Street, San Francisco (then official headquarters of the Communist Party), exhibit No. 12.

Exhibit No. 13 is a printed circular advertising a youth mass meeting in support of the student antiwar strike, which was held in San Francisco on April 12, 1935; it will be noted that John D.

Schomaker and Ben Legere, Communists, heretofore referred to in the "Political" section of this report, were among the speakers.

As further evidence of the Communist influence in and domination of the American Youth Congress, as well as the American League Against War and Fascism, excerpts from Earl Browder's book *Communism in the United States* are submitted as exhibit No. 14.

Exhibit No. 15 is a circular calling for a demonstration of youth on Memorial Day in protest against war preparations. This demonstration was conducted under the auspices of the youth section of the American League Against War and Fascism, and the attention of the committee is directed to the fact that the mass meeting scheduled for the evening of May 30 was held at 121 Haight Street, San Francisco, which is the official Communist headquarters. Here again is a tie-in between the American League Against War and Fascism and the Communist Party.

There is submitted as exhibit No. 16 a mimeographed book known as *Communist Campanile*, published by the University of California branch of the Young Communist League, which is indicative of a more direct and less subtle approach in enlisting the support of so-called liberal-minded teachers and students.

The executive committee of the Young Communist International at Moscow issued a special statement on August 14, 1934, to the youth of the world, in which the dangers of an impending war, the sufferings from starvation and poverty, established the basis for an emotional appeal to the immature minds. Exhibit No. 17.

A circular issued in September 1935, calling for a demonstration in behalf of Ethiopia under the auspices of the Youth Committee for the Defense of Ethiopia, is submitted as exhibit No. 18.

While any movement which has as its objective the promotion of culture or recreation among youth is a move in the right direction, the Communists often use this as a medium for the spread of propaganda. In 1937, through the promotion of the Communist Party, there was established a camp for boys and girls at Bonanza Springs, Lake County, Calif., and the youth who attended this camp were thoroughly inoculated with the A. B. C.'s of Communist propaganda.

The attention of the committee is directed to the personnel of the camp advisory committee which appears in exhibit No. 19. Among its members are the following Communists: G. O. Brown, Mrs. Roberta Jones, Dr. S. A. Goldman, Henry Schmidt, Carmen Lucia, George Woolf, Dr. Vera S. Goldman, Harry Bridges, Rev. Herrick J. Lane, Mrs. Anna Harrington.

A general coverage of the Communist control of the youth movement is contained in a report compiled by the intelligence bureau of the Los Angeles police department, annexed as exhibit No. 20.

Mimeograph copy (authenticated by the Civil Council of Defense, Long Beach, Calif.) of a handbook for young Communists entitled "Young Communists in Action" is tendered as exhibit No. 21.

"New Frontiers" is the title of a yearbook issued by the Young Communist League of California, which is submitted as exhibit No. 22. On page 6 of this exhibit will be found a fraternal letter of greeting from Tom Mooney, as well as a picture of Mooney with Frank Carlson, State secretary of the Young Communist League, and on page 7 there is a photograph of six members of the Y. C. L. who interrupted the

Olympic Games of Los Angeles in 1932 by running around the race-track with "Free Mooney" signs fastened on their backs. Also on the same page will be found a photograph of a students' peace strike at the Los Angeles Junior College. Under the picture is stated: "Y. C. L'ers supported the strike and played a prominent role in furthering it."

On pages 10 and 35 of New Frontiers is given a brief personal history of Ed Alexander, State educational director of the Y. C. L., from which will be noted his gradual progression from his expulsion from college to the occupation of newsboy, then national organizer for the National Student League, subsequently organizer for the American student unions in Chicago and Los Angeles, and now officially identified with the Young Communist League.

Attention is directed to page 32 of New Frontiers, also typical of the progression from radical rebellion to official recognition by the Young Communist League as quoted in the following:

The United Youth Club (Los Angeles) has officers of plenty high caliber. President Joe—17-year-old native of New Mexico—joined the league in 1936 after selling papers, rebelling in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps, and learning in the A. S. U. (American Student Union).

Further evidence of Communist progression is indicated in the same paragraph on the same page, in the following:

Walt Walton is a stanch Young Communist leaguer. After joining the league in '31, Walt organized the league in Long Beach, organized the Young Communist League in Gallup, N. Mex., led the bloody Gallup coal strike in 1933, and wound up as district organizer of district No. 19 for a year and a half. Walt is leaving for San Diego soon, to whip that sunny old town into shape.

As further establishing the fact that the Young Communist League is following the policy of the Communist Party in promoting labor unrest and in creating agitation, the following quotation is taken from page 29 of New Frontiers describing in part the work of the Y. C. L. A.:

The league gave valuable service in the Douglas Aircraft strike, the Hollywood Studio strike, and the Tea Garden Cannery strike.

It must be readily apparent from the foregoing that promotion of the Young Communist League is conditional upon the ability of the individual member to increase his effectiveness in agitation, strikes, and sabotage.

That the Communist Party firmly believes that its future development depends largely upon the indoctrination of youth is evidenced in exhibit No. 23 which is a copy of the March 4, 1936, issue of the American Citizen, in which the leading article is entitled "Catch 'em Young," and the attention of the committee is particularly directed to this article.

In summarizing it may be authentically stated that the principal branches and affiliates of the Communist Party have maintained a youth section with modification of propaganda to fit the needs of the younger generation. The initial approach of the youth section of the party is through the media of the Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., sport clubs, schools, and colleges. Once the seed of the Socialist doctrine of the Marx is planted the soil is meticulously tended until the germ blossoms forth as a full fledged member of the Young Communist League.

Mr. STARNES. You made the statement that, according to the figures you had available, the prices paid for agricultural labor in California were higher than in any other section of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. And yet, that was the very point at which they struck, or at which the Communist first struck.

Mr. KNOWLES. The daily wages for farm labor out there are twice what they average in the United States.

Mr. STARNES. It does not seem that they were going in there for the purpose of improving living conditions or raising wages, because there was no less fruitful field throughout the country for those activities. I am wondering whether, as a result of your investigation, you found that they first began their activities through this union, and that they first tried to strike in those organizations, occupations, and industries where wages were the highest?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. I think that is important, because it shows that they were not trying to help the down-trodden, underpaid, or underprivileged, since they first struck in regions where wages were highest and hours of labor less.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. What do you take up next?

Mr. KNOWLES. The next subjects are treated in the academic brief, and in the professional, alien, and political briefs.

Mr. NIMMO. We have four others.

Mr. STARNES. You have a brief covering their activities in a so-called political way.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. We will recess now, and will resume the hearings at 2 o'clock.

(Thereupon, the committee took a recess until 2 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

(The subcommittee resumed its session at 2 p. m.)

Mr. STARNES. The committee will resume its hearings.

Mr. Knowles, you may proceed at this time with a discussion of the suppression of un-American activities in the schools and colleges. I understand that you have a brief statement to present on that subject.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir; I have.

This brief presents certain facts regarding the activities of the Communist Party on the Pacific coast in the field of our institutions of learning. It is accompanied by numerous exhibits that amplify the next.

To enable a proper consideration by the committee of the infiltration by the Communist Party into our institutions of education, this report will be subdivided into subjects under the following classification: A. Colleges; B. Junior colleges; C. High schools; D. Grade and elementary schools; E. Workers' schools; F. Workers' summer schools.

Throughout the whole academic structure we find the same liaison group of the united front that we find in the youth movement of the Communist Party, United States of America; for example, the Ameri-

can Student Union, the American League Against War and Fascism, the Young Communist League, the Communist Party, and others.

Numerically we find almost as many professors and instructors involved in the movement as we do students, and while on the surface it would appear that the greatest danger to our democratic institutions and traditions would appear in our students, yet the danger of indoctrination by the instructors cannot be overlooked. While it is impossible to supply to the committee a complete list of individual college instructors in our western colleges as indicative of these activities, attention is directed to exhibit No. 1, covering a professor and a teacher at the University of California whose activities in behalf of labor agitators were such as to cause the district attorney of Stanislaus County, Calif., to ask the university faculty to dismiss these instructors. One of them, Dr. Max Radin, professor of law, has over the past few years frequently appeared as a speaker in behalf of radical organizations and legislation. There is an unwritten law among the faculties of the universities throughout the United States that after an instructor has served as a professor for a period of 3 years' time nothing short of murder or a gross-morals offense can secure his dismissal.

In the case of Harry Conover, teaching assistant in economics, in some manner or other the authorities of the University of California arranged to bring about a severance of his connection with that institution as a result of the charges filed against him.

In other universities in California, such as Stanford, there has been a consistent attempt to create a group similar to that existing at Columbia University, which is notorious for its "liberal subversive activities."

The head of the Stanford School of Education, Dr. G. N. Kefauver, has been severely criticized for the domination which he has attempted to exercise over contemporary teachers in other California schools. Attention of the committee is directed to exhibit No. 2, which is a clipping from the Palo Alto-Mayfield News of September 6, 1935, relating to the Arizona Guidance Conference held in March 1934, at which meeting Dr. Kefauver and Harold C. Hand, also of Stanford University, were the most active participants. A program of this conference is submitted as exhibit No. 3.

A partial list of other instructors at Stanford University who have been active in liberal and radical movements is submitted as exhibit No. 4.

It is quite apparent that the influence of Dr. George Counts and other liberal members of the faculty of Columbia University is felt to a strong degree at Stanford. Counts is also editor of the Social Frontier, which is described as a "journal of educational criticisms and reconstruction" and which is submitted as exhibit No. 5.

On page 2 of this publication it will be noted that Dr. Kefauver is a member of the board of directors of the Social Frontier.

Because of the incessant activities of Dr. Thomas Addis, of Stanford University, who has also been referred to in the political section of this report, the American Legion Department of California directed this situation to the attention of the board of trustees on May 18, 1936. Correspondence covering this matter is submitted as exhibits Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9. To date Dr. Addis is still occupying his position and continues unceasingly his radical activities.

The foregoing instances and exhibits referred to therein are not submitted as all-inclusive, but merely as typical illustrations of the degree to which our educational institutions have been impregnated with Marxian philosophies.

Through the direct as well as the subtle encouragement by the instructors in our universities, we find a growing tendency toward the enlistment of students in extracurricular activities of a radical nature, among which may be mentioned the following: American Student Union, American Youth Congress, American Peace Committee—Youth Section, Fellowship of Reconciliation, National Council for Methodist Youth, and many other similar organizations.

Mr. STARNES. Dr. Radin is a known Communist.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. How about Harry Conover? Do you know that Harry Conover is a Communist?

Mr. KNOWLES. It has been so reported, and I think it can be established by witnesses.

Mr. STARNES. Who is Dr. Kefauver?

Mr. KNOWLES. He is the head of the school of education of Stanford University.

Mr. STARNES. It is your charge that these men have been using or are carrying the Communist Party line through their school activities?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. And when we reach the west coast you will have witnesses who will substantiate that charge?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. In your investigation of un-American activities, have you found any Nazi or Fascist activities in the schools and colleges on the Pacific coast?

Mr. KNOWLES. Not markedly; no, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Do you find the Nazis quite active in promoting youth movements?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir; and there are also several Italian groups being formed.

Mr. STARNES. In what large centers of the Pacific coast do you find that Nazi activities are most marked?

Mr. KNOWLES. Fairly well up and down the whole coast, including San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose, Los Angeles, and San Diego. Those are some of the particular places that have come to our attention.

Mr. STARNES. Do you have anything touching Nazi activities in your brief?

Mr. KNOWLES. No, sir; we have several briefs uncompleted, and that is one of them.

Mr. STARNES. You are working on that.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. That material will be available to us.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. With reference to Black Shirts and Fascist organizations on the Pacific coast, are they quite numerous?

Mr. KNOWLES. No, sir; they are very small in number.

Mr. STARNES. Can you give us any estimate of the number?

Mr. KNOWLES. No, sir; I cannot.

Mr. STARNES. Where are they most active?

Mr. KNOWLES. At San Francisco, particularly; but not to any great extent. They are very nominal.

Mr. STARNES. You may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLES. From interviews with students and from attendance at meetings at which these teachers have spoken, the vast majority of the liberal and radical groups in our colleges do not openly espouse communism, but the effect of the direct and indirect suggestions to the students is far more deadly in its results than a frank and outspoken support of the Communist doctrines. In most instances it is not the specific utterance of the instructors with which Americanism can find fault, but it is the far more insidious method by which our students in high schools, grammar schools, and colleges leave these institutions with an unhealthy disrespect for the founders of our country and for such outstanding patriots as George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and others. In other words, by tearing down our traditions and our heritages the mind of the adolescent is left in a receptive state for the doctrine of communism.

In the cause of truth we should not continue to build up false precepts concerning our own heroes and statesmen of earlier history, but the willful tearing down of traditions surrounding the adoption of our Constitution and sincerity of our forefathers in building a democracy, can have but one malignant purpose and that is to inculcate in the minds of the students a disrespect for American traditions which per se almost invariably causes at least a partial acceptance of false ideology.

By way of illustration and substantiation of the foregoing statements there is submitted as "Exhibit No. 10," a factual letter written by a student of Stanford University who had spent 8 years in high school and in college in the R. O. T. C. activities. This young man, like many others, was brought up by his parents to respect and revere our established institutions. He leaves college a cynic as to American ideals.

Other phases of this subject will be covered in the "Youth" section of this report.

The attention of the committee is here directed to "Exhibit No. 11," a publication known as The Academic Front, issued by the Communist Party and distributed among the faculty and the students of the University of California.

At the University of California we find the following professors and teachers have interested themselves in the left-wing movement. It is not claimed nor alleged that all of them are members of the Communist Party, but it is definitely stated that they are used as tools for the furtherance of that left-wing movement.

A. S. Kaun, J. L. Kirchen, Haakon Chevalier (referred to in the political section), T. K. Whipple, Max Radin, G. P. Adams, Ralph Chaney, A. M. Kidd, Robert A. Brady.

The most outstanding proponent of radical movements is Prof. Max Radin. Next in line comes Prof. A. M. Kidd, who presided at a meeting of the Conference for the Repeal of the Criminal Syndicalism law held in San Francisco in 1935.

As a further indication of the left-wing trend among the teachers of all schooling gradations, there is submitted as "Exhibit No. 12" a clipping from the American Citizen of March 27, 1936, with reference to the formation of the California Federation of Teachers,

which held a 2-day conference at Palo Alto, Calif., on March 14 and 15 of that year. The attention of the committee is directed to the fact that Communist resolutions were unanimously endorsed as follows:

Repeal of the Criminal Syndicalism Act.

Abolition of military training.

Freedom for Tom Mooney.

Reinstatement of Victor Jewett (hereafter referred to in this section of the report).

Enactment of the Frazier-Lundeen bill.

It may be mentioned, in passing, that the California Federation of Teachers is not recognized by the American Federation of Labor as a legitimate union.

B. JUNIOR COLLEGES

Students in the junior colleges, especially those of San Diego, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Chico, run the same gamut as do those at the universities and a similar situation with respect as to the activities of radical instructors is manifested. By way of example, the activities of one John G. Iliff, director of economics at the San Mateo Junior College, became so apparent from his frequent appearance on the platform of Communist meetings that the citizenry of San Mateo, Calif., became aroused and requested his dismissal by the school trustees. Because, however, of the California State Teachers tenure law his removal was impossible and he continues to teach at that institution.

Exhibit No. 13 is a program of a celebration known as the Vietcherinka of a "Victorious Russian Revolution" under the sponsorship of the Friends of the Soviet Union, which Communist organization will be dealt with in the professional section of this report. It will be noted that the three speakers were John Iliff, Ella Winter, Communist writer; and Beatrice Kinkead, also a Communist, both of whom have been referred to in the professional section of this report. On the page opposite Professor Iliff's name appears the following announcement:

We expect to send a large number of delegates from San Francisco trade unions to participate in the May Day celebration in Moscow in 1936 (May Day is the Red International labor holiday).

Professor Iliff has made frequent trips to the U. S. S. R., and, while no proof can be submitted, it is generally reported that these trips are subsidized by the Russian Government to compensate Iliff for the spreading of Communist propaganda.

Program of a meeting held in San Francisco on November 7, 1935, in observance of the anniversary of Russian revolution is submitted as exhibit No. 14. It will be noted that Professor Iliff was assigned the subject Socialism Victorious and that he had as speaking companions Beatrice Kinkead, heretofore referred to, and Ben Dobbs, of the Young Communist League. In the singing of the Russian Internationale, Professor Iliff joined with other platform guests and with the audience in raising his clenched fist in the recognized Russian salute. Witnesses to this effect can be secured, but it is not believed the point is of sufficient importance to take up the time of the committee.

On January 27, 1936, Professor Iliff presided as chairman of a meeting held under the auspices of the American Committee for Peace and Friendship of the Soviet People. (See exhibit No. 15.)

At the San Diego Junior College, the assistant professor in the department of psychology and philosophy is one Harry C. Steinmetz, who assumed such an active part in the radical labor movement as to occasion his deposition by the officials of the American Federation of Labor. Steinmetz is an official of the California Federation of Teachers (a left-wing organization).

Bertha Monroe, assistant professor of sociology in the San Francisco State Teachers College, has been an active proponent of the American League for Peace and Democracy (former American League Against War and Fascism), and is also an official of the Communist Women's League for Peace and Freedom. Mrs. Monroe also has been an ardent proponent in a movement among the Parent-Teacher Associations for the study of Cause and Cure of War, as well as in other pacifist organizations. Exhibit No. 16 is notice of classes conducted by Mrs. Monroe.

C. HIGH SCHOOLS

The most outstanding case insofar as the spreading of Communist propaganda in our high schools was that of Victor R. Jewett, teacher of social studies in Eureka Junior High School, who was removed by the school board in that city for his communistic activities and teachings. His case was carried to the district court of appeals and was upheld by the third appellate district on May 17, 1937.

The court expressed itself as approving the action of the school trustees in removing Jewett on the basis of his unprofessional conduct. Exhibits Nos. 17, 18, and 19 establish the authenticity of the statements made in respect to Jewett.

D. GRADE AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

While it has been commonly reported that many teachers of elementary grades in our public schools have inculcated in the minds of pupils certain radical or liberal teachings, these instances have not been sufficiently overt nor is enough evidence available to justify a detailed report on this aspect.

In connection with the grade schools, however, there is visible the pacifist movement promulgated by the women's section of the American League Against War and Fascism to bring before Parent-Teacher Association groups their insidious propaganda of disarmament. The far-reaching effect of this program was evidenced through the adoption at the 1937 convention of the Parent-Teacher Association of California of the theme "Peace Through Understanding."

E. WORKER SCHOOLS

For several years the Communist Party, U. S. A., maintained workers schools for its own members, as well as for the purpose of teaching its theories and practices to others. Exhibits Nos. 20 to 35 are self-explanatory.

Exhibit No. 36, advertising the 1935 school, relates to the opening program. The attention of the committee is directed to the fact that

this meeting was held at 121 Haight Street, San Francisco (local Communist headquarters), and that one of the speakers was Beatrice Kinkead, heretofore referred to in both the professional and academic sections of this report. A second speaker was one James Branch, who later became one of the all too few deportees as a Communist alien, and who is the husband of a San Francisco public-school teacher.

The name of the school was changed in the latter part of 1936 to the Progressive Labor School, but similarity of the subjects and the instructors left no doubt as to its Communist dominations.

F. WORKERS SUMMER SCHOOLS

There is attached as exhibit No. 37 a report of the 1935 summer school for workers, which was held on the campus of the University of California at Berkeley. The first two pages of this exhibit are given to the delineation of radical individuals and organizations participating in this school and the succeeding pages are excerpts from the log record of the school. The attention of the committee is particularly directed to the underscored portions of this school log, all of which have to do with Communists or communistic organizations. On page 9 of this exhibit is an article contributed to the log record by John C. Kennedy, a member of the faculty who is supervisor of workers education for the State of Washington, and to the statement contained therein reading as follows:

Can we live on ideals alone? No; I haven't forgotten that the army must eat. But those who join this army must say first of all, "We're going to build a new world where there will be security and plenty for all!" If necessary, we'll eat on the country as we march along. Some will toil all day in shop, store, mine, mill, or factory, but they'll organize and march just the same in the new army for the common good. Some will be unemployed, on relief, on Government work-relief projects. They, too, will march in the great new army battling for the common good.

In 1935 the Workers Summer School was sponsored partly by the extension division of the University of California, but because of its communistic nature the university authorities withdraw its endorsement although the summer school still continues in its printed matter to advertise the university as one of the sponsoring groups. Subsequently the use of the campus was denied to this radical group, and while the schools are still held in Berkeley, Calif., they are now conducted outside the university grounds.

There is submitted, as exhibit No. 38, log book covering the 1938 Summer School for Workers, which is now known as the Pacific Coast School for Workers. The attention of the committee is here called to the fact that the director of this school is none other than George P. Hedley, a minister without a portfolio, who has heretofore been discussed in the professional section of this report. While not as preponderantly communistic in its tone as the 1935 school, an examination of the list of faculty members of the school discloses that a large percentage of both groups are identified with Communist and kindred organizations.

The attention of the committee is also particularly directed to the title on the cover page of this exhibit, "Solidarity." This is the title of a very popular Communist song and is a word which is invariably used in Communist literature.

Attention is also directed to the fact that this school was devoted to propagandizing in behalf of the union labor organization, as well as the promulgation of liberal and radical education.

Pages 30 to 32 are devoted to the encouragement of "cooperatives" and featuring James San Jule, a member of the Communist Party, who has been discussed in the political section of this report. San Jule is a product of the W. P. A. educational program.

Pages 66 to 69 are devoted to the Communist cause of Loyalist Spain.

Pages 104 to 114 report the organizational and strike activities of various unions which were represented at the summer school for workers.

On pages 122 to 126 are reproduced radical and prounion songs which were sung by the classes during the school sessions.

On page 127 appears the reproduction of a song originally published in the Communist Peoples World of June 30.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know how these summer schools and the schools for workers are financed?

Mr. KNOWLES. To a certain extent through small contributions by the students themselves.

Mr. STARNES. Who sponsors these workers' schools and workers' summer schools?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is pretty difficult to say. We can only judge by the subjects matter that they take up. That is the real background, I would say. The committee has not been able to determine the exact background of them.

Mr. STARNES. Are the members of the faculties of the workers' schools and workers' summer schools members of the Communist Party?

Mr. KNOWLES. In the workers' schools, exclusively so, and in the summer schools preponderantly so, or a majority of them are.

Mr. STARNES. From that you make the deduction that the purpose of the schools is really to inculcate or indoctrinate the Communist theory in the student body.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. What type of program do they have?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is shown by the exhibits.

Mr. STARNES. When did they first initiate this character of work in workers' schools and summer workers' schools on the Pacific coast?

Mr. KNOWLES. About 1934 for the workers' schools, and in 1935, I think, they had the first summer school, or that is when it first came to our attention.

Mr. STARNES. Will you list for the benefit of the committee the members of the faculties in the workers' school and workers' summer schools who are known to be Communists?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. And in connection with your brief on agriculture, I wish that, in addition to listing for the benefit of the committee the organizers and agitators in that section, who are known to be Communists, you also list those known to be aliens or foreign-born.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Do you have any other statement you wish to make with reference to the brief you have just read, in the way of a summary?

Mr. NIMMO. No, sir; I do not believe that a summary is necessary.

Mr. STARNES. The committee would like to have the brief on aliens.

Mr. NIMMO. I wonder if it might be possible to present this professional brief at this time?

Mr. STARNES. Does it tie in with the brief you have just read?

Mr. NIMMO. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. How long a brief is it?

Mr. NIMMO. It contains 16 pages. It is a little longer than the one just presented, but not much longer.

Mr. STARNES. You can present it in about 20 minutes' time?

Mr. NIMMO. Yes, sir.

This brief presents certain facts, relating to the activities of the Communist Party among so-called professional groups.

It is supported by documentary evidence which it is believed will fully substantiate the alarming degree to which Communist thought and propaganda have permeated the white-collar class.

Presented on the following pages is an outline of the activity of the Communist Party through knowledge of, and infiltration into, professional groups.

PROFESSIONAL GROUPS

A. Inter-Professional Association.

B. Western Writers Congress.

C. Simon J. Lubin Society.

D. American Friends of the Soviet Union.

E. North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

Inter-Professional Association: While the exact date upon which this organization was instituted is not known, its activity was evidenced in the early part of 1935 and was organized by members of unit No. 100 of the professional section of the Communist Party. The I. P. A. is fully under Communist Party control. According to its constitution (exhibit No. 1), it was organized for the purpose of:

1. The protection of the economic and social security and professional interests of professional workers.

2. To cooperate with the labor movement in the common interest of the workers.

The head office of the I. P. A. is located in room 600, 130 East Twenty-second Street, New York City; its national chairman is Mary Van Kleeck, who is also affiliated with the following organizations, of which some are known to be communistically inclined or controlled: Member, board of directors, American Civil Liberties Union; assistant director, Industrial Relations Institute; director of industrial studies, Russell Sage Foundation; one of the sponsors of the National Unemployment Congress held in Washington, D. C., January 5, 6, and 7, 1935.

A copy of the January 1936 I. P. A. News Bulletin dealing with a proposed workers' social insurance bill is submitted as exhibit No. 2.

Mary Van Kleeck, while disclaiming membership in the Communist Party, is a member of a "closed unit" of the Communist Party in New York, and the International Industrial Relations Institute, of

which she is assistant director, is reported to be a Communist sponsored and controlled organization.

On May 13, 1935, Mary Van Kleeck appeared before the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco in a session held in the supervisors' chambers, city and county of San Francisco, and spoke at length in favor of repeal of the California Criminal Syndicalism Act. The Communist Daily Worker, July 11, 1935, states that Miss Van Kleeck is a member of the editorial board of Book Union, Inc. According to Items of Interest, January 15, 1936, Miss Van Kleeck has been a frequent speaker at radical meetings. Miss Van Kleeck is reported to have spoken and to have circulated Congress urging recognition of the Soviet Union, non-deportation of alien Communists, and so forth. Miss Van Kleeck is also a member of the National Federation of Federal Employees, the Women's Trade Union League, National Consumers' League, and American Association for Labor Legislation.

Carey McWilliams, a California attorney, is national vice chairman. His affiliations and activities include the following: Member of the American Civil Liberties Union, and American League Against War and Fascism. Appointed in May 1936 to a position on the National Labor Relations Board. Is a charter member of the Communist-promoted Western Writers Congress; also a member of the Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners. Western Worker (official Pacific-coast paper of the Communist Party), in its issue of April 12, 1937, reports McWilliams as chairman of Irish Friends of Spanish Democracy. He is also a member of the communistic Simon J. Lubin Society. Western Worker, of April 26, 1937, reports McWilliams as being speaker at a meeting of the Conference for Constitutional Rights for the Negro People (Communist) under the auspices of the International Workers Order (Communist) held in Los Angeles.

As indicating the local activities of the I. P. A., among the many resolutions which have been enacted, the following are typical illustrations of the trend and scope of subjects acted upon by the local branch of the I. P. A.: Release of the Modesto prisoners; protesting the deportation of Jack Warnick, a known Communist illegally in this country; protesting against the ban of prohibition established by the Fresno County Board of Education in connection with the use of school auditoriums by the Communist Party; promotion of the Simon J. Lubin Society, the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, Western Writers Congress, and so forth.

(Every communistic group has adopted similar resolutions.)

As further evidence of the radical activities of the I. P. A., the following legislative measures were proposed by that organization at a recent State legislative meeting: An antivigilante bill; the repeal of the San Francisco antipicketing ordinance; a measure legalizing picketing; a law to prohibit the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes; a law requiring the registration of labor spies; a law to prevent the arming of guards employed to protect private property; a law to prevent strikebreakers from being transported from one county to another within the State; a resolution to establish a State legislative committee similar in its objectives to the La Follette committee; a law to prevent the use of State motor-vehicle police officers in any strike riots.

Perhaps the best indication of the character of the organization itself is the type of people who are active within it, either as members or speakers. A partial list of these will be found in the attached exhibit No. 3.

Mr. STARNES. As to Mr. McWilliams, is the charge made that he is a Communist, or that he is affiliated with or a member of an organization which is Communist-inspired or controlled?

Mr. KNOWLES. The latter.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, he is a member of the Inter-Professional Association?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. And that is known to be organized by members of the Communist Party, and that it is fully under Communist Party control?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. He is national vice chairman?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIMMO. Attention is directed to exhibit No. 4, which contains further information bearing on the I. P. A.

Submitted as exhibit No. 5 is the June-July issue of the bulletin of the San Francisco chapter of the I. P. A. On page 1 it will be noted that this chapter supports the Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy with which it shares offices at 83 McAllister Street, San Francisco. Page 2 of the same exhibit refers to a meeting of the I. P. A. members, held on June 16 of that year. Attention is directed to the list of speakers on that occasion, which includes Dr. G. Facci, a "fellow traveler," who has been active in spreading propaganda among the Italian people of the San Francisco Bay area and who has also attempted to cause unrest among the agricultural workers.

Dr. Carl Rhodehamel, Communist, director of the Communist-sponsored California people's legislative conference (dealt with in the political section of this report).

Dr. George Hedley, a preacher without a pulpit, who had charge of the 1937-38 sessions of the radically promoted Western Summer School for Workers, which will be discussed in this report under the academic section.

Revels Cayton, a Negro Communist, who has been especially active in creating unrest on the San Francisco water front.

The building in which the San Francisco offices of the I. P. A. are located at 83 McAllister Street, also houses the following Communist organizations:

American League for Peace and Democracy, room 314.

California Youth Congress, room 412.

Professional Placement Bureau, room 422.

Federal Employees, room 419.

Medical Aid to Spanish Democracy, room 320.

American Friends of Spanish Democracy, room 320.

Inter-Professional Association, room 320.

Western Writers' League, room 320.

Capital and Labor Conference, room 319.

Council to Fight Anti-Semitism, room 322.

As further evidence of the communistic character of the I. P. A., there have been taken at random a record of a few of the speakers

who appeared at the meetings of this organization, which is herewith presented:

Cleta O'Connor, chairman, county committee, Communist Party.

Richard Flamert, a member of unit 102 of the professional section of the Communist Party and State president of Cooperatives, an organization closely affiliated with the Consumers Union, which latter organization was discussed in the political section of this report.

Dr. Edward Lindeman, national director of the W. P. A. recreation project and contributing editor of the Communist weekly, New Republic.

Ada Clement, a member of unit 105, professional section of the Communist Party, who has conducted several tours to the Soviet Union.

Caroline Decker, one of the criminal syndicalist prisoners.

Bert Leech, a Communist Party member, then San Francisco secretary of the American League Against War and Fascism (now known as the American League for Peace and Democracy).

B. WESTERN WRITERS CONGRESS

In the fall of 1936, a group of liberal and communistic writers issued a call for a conference to be held in San Francisco on November 13, which continued throughout the following day. The call for the congress was issued by Harry Carlisle, former editor of the Communist paper, Western Worker. Following were the sponsors for this congress:

Upton Sinclair, Sara Bard Field, Haakon Chevalier, Howard Hill, John D. Barry, Dorothy Parker, John Steinbeck, Harold Chapman Brown, Humphrey Cobb, Col. E. S. Scott Wood, Alexander Kaun, Carey McWilliams, and other writers and liberals.

Upton Sinclair has been discussed in the political section of this report.

Sara Bard Field has taken an active part in many radical movements.

Haakon Chevalier is a professor at the University of California and a Communist.

Howard Hill was the former president of the Northern California Newspaper Guild, a C. I. O. organizer.

John D. Barry is a columnist on the San Francisco News, who presides at many Communist and liberal meetings.

Carey McWilliams is a radical who has been discussed under the heading of "Inter-Professional Association," in this section of the report.

Some of the others are known to be highly liberal, but cannot definitely be identified as members of the Communist Party.

Among those sending greetings to the congress were Tom Mooney, John Strachey, and Thomas Mann, English Communists; Simon J. Lubin Society, and the American League Against War and Fascism.

Included among those participating in the conference were:

Ella Winter, Communist, who read excerpts from a note written by the late Lincoln Steffens to Harry Bridges.

Mrs. Kate Crane-Gratz, a wealthy revolutionary of Altadena, Calif., who urged freedom for Tom Mooney, and who has substantially aided the Communist Party financially.

Loren Miller, contributing editor to *New Masses* and a member of the Communist Party.

Gifford Cochran, member of a closed unit of the Communist Party and active in behalf of Lawrence Simpson, a Communist who was imprisoned in Germany for radical activities in that country.

Harry Carlisle, editor of the *Western Worker* and organizational secretary of the Western Writers' Congress.

Tanna Alex, Communist candidate for public office on United Labor Party ticket in 1935, and also active in the International Labor Defense.

Redfern Mason, candidate for mayor on the Labor Union ticket for 1935, who has been discussed in the political section.

Robin Kinkead, supervisor on the Federal Writers' project in San Francisco. His mother, Beatrice Kinkead, is a well-known Communist who has made several trips to Russia and participated in the promotion of tours to that country.

Harry Bridges, Communist C. I. O. leader, was a guest speaker at the Western Writers' Congress on November 14.

The attention of the committee is directed to the fact that the Communist Harry Bridges was the only labor leader who was invited to address the congress.

C. SIMON J. LUBIN SOCIETY

This organization was founded in the fall of 1936, taking its name from the late Simon J. Lubin, former head of the State housing and immigration department, who was admittedly a member of the Industrial Workers of the World.

The Simon J. Lubin Society was organized by unit 104 of the professional section. This unit was doing research work for the agricultural activities of the party, due to the fact that most of the members in 1936 worked for the Resettlement Administration.

Helen Horn (Mrs. Harry Hosmer) and Dr. Soule, members of the unit, conceived the idea of forming a club or society that would include nonparty members to help with the work of their unit. Both knew David Lubin, Simon J. Lubin's son, and through Mrs. Robert McWilliams met Mrs. Lubin, Sr. They persuaded the Lubins to allow them to name the "club" after Simon J. Lubin. The Lubins did not know the real purpose behind the organization of the Simon J. Lubin Society. Neither did they know it was controlled by the Communist Party. For that matter, neither did Dr. Russell Rypins, the president of the society.

After unit 104 organized this society, the leader of the professional section, in 1936, saw that its scope could be considerably widened, so, with the aid of Donald Henderson, who was visiting in San Francisco at that time, the present activities of the society were worked out. This organization is the channel through which the Communist Party conducts its bitter fight against the farming industry.

Shortly after its formation, the Society injected itself into a controversy arising from the 1936 strike of lettuce workers in the Salinas Valley area, through an action against lettuce growers because of alleged illegal blacklisting of strikers. Aubrey Grossman, a Communist attorney referred to in the political section of this report,

and whose admission to the bar was protested by the American Legion because of his known Communist activities, represented the plaintiffs in the action.

The society appeared with the American League Against War and Fascism as joint sponsors for a meeting held in San Francisco on May 5, 1937, to discuss the cannery workers' strike in the San Joaquin area, California.

For a short time in 1937 the society occupied joint offices with the Conference for Repeal of the Criminal Syndicalism Act.

The society sponsored a talk on September 7, 1937, by Donald Henderson, Communist, national president of the C. I. O. union known as the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America. He was dismissed from the faculty of Columbia University in 1933 because of his Communistic activities.

D. AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE SOVIET UNION

Because of the national character of this organization, it is not deemed necessary to submit to the committee proof of its Communist sponsorship and control. There is, however, presented as indicating the degree of activity in the northern California area, such exhibits and comments which may be of interest to the committee.

Locally the American Friends of the Soviet Union has been under the organizational leadership of one William Boeker. Because of recent inactivity of this Communist branch, Boeker is now in charge of the International Book Shop, purveyors of Communist literature, 170 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, and has at times in addition to Communist activities, also received wages from W. P. A. Boeker is a known Communist and was formerly registered as such.

Exhibit No. 6 advertises a meeting held in San Francisco on July 16, 1935, at which Prof. John Ilif spoke.

There is also submitted exhibit No. 7, advertising a mass meeting held on October 1, 1935, at which Communists Ben Legere and Tanna Alex were speakers.

The chairman of the meeting, A. T. Leerburg, is also a member of the Communist Party.

Exhibit No. 8 is a copy of a highly abusive publication issued by the Friends of the Soviet Union, entitled "Anti-Hearst Examiner." This was issued in November 1935. The attention of the committee is directed to the vicious cartoon on the first page of this publication.

Exhibit No. 9 is a handbill advertising a lecture given by Sonia Baltrum. This woman is an organizer for the Textile Workers Committee (C. I. O.). The topic of her lecture was "How I Lived and worked in the Soviet Union." Sonia Baltrum is a registered Communist.

Exhibit No. 10 advertises a Vietcherinka which was held in San Francisco on June 13, 1935, at which the speaker was Redfern Mason, United Labor Party candidate for mayor in the 1936 election, and who has been discussed in the political section of this report.

Several exhibits, Nos. 11 to 18, which have not been specifically mentioned, are also submitted for the information of the committee.

E. NORTH AMERICAN COMMITTEE TO AID SPANISH DEMOCRACY

In its efforts to secure support of the Spanish Communist cause, local members of the Communist Party have been highly successful in arousing the sympathies of a large cross-section of our business and professional fields. Not only have vast sums of money been raised in the name of humanity in support of the Spanish Communist cause, but in addition the personal services of people in all walks of life have also been enrolled and until within the last few months active solicitation, in direct violation of our neutrality laws, was carried on for the enrollment of volunteers to fight for Spanish democracy. In order to reach people in various walks of life the activities of the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, have been divided into several groups, such as:

Medical Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

Technical Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

Youth Section to Aid Spanish Democracy.

Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

Irish-American Committee for Defense of Spanish Democracy.

While it is not claimed that all of the participants in this movement and in the various groups comprising it are Communists, the movement itself is nevertheless Communist inspired and Communist controlled.

Several exhibits, Nos. 19 to 30, are submitted as indicative of various meetings which have been held in behalf of the Spanish cause.

Exhibit No. 31 advertises a meeting held in San Francisco on October 6, 1937, at which the "Fighting Flahertys" appeared. These three brothers are reported to be members of the Communist Party.

There is next submitted exhibit 32, a handbill advertising a meeting held on May 27, 1938, at which the Right Reverend Edward L. Parsons was chairman. Bishop Parsons is also national vice chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union and is head of the Episcopal Diocese of California. This is mentioned to indicate the tie-in between the A. C. L. U., the Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, the Communist Party, and the church.

Z. R. Brown, secretary-treasurer of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, presided at a meeting of Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, held in San Francisco on November 3, 1937. Brown is a known Communist and mention is made of this particular meeting to indicate the close affiliation between the Communist Party and the Friends of Spanish Democracy. We refer the committee to exhibit 33.

The next exhibit submitted is No. 34, which is a handbill advertising a lecture on the Spanish war situation held under the auspices of the Workers Alliance of America. Here is another very definite tie-in between the Spanish Loyalist cause and the Communist Party.

The next exhibit, No. 35, advertises an 8-day exposition on the subject Loyalist Spain at War and the attention of the committee is particularly directed to the following Communist sponsors: American League for Peace and Democracy; the Youth Committee; International Workers' Order; United Council to Combat Anti-semitism and Nazi-ism.

While it is believed that the committee is in possession of report No. 128, issued by the Department of State, and consisting of a

tabulation of receipts and expenditures by the various organizations soliciting funds for Spanish relief, in the event that the information is not readily at hand, there is submitted as exhibit No. 36 a copy of this report, which indicates the extraction from the American public of vast sums of money for the Spanish Communist cause.

In addition to the organizations specifically mentioned above, the professional section of the Communist Party has established as points of concentration in the vicinity of San Francisco the following groups, in each of which they maintain "party fractions" that meet once each week for the purpose of furtherance of the Communist Party's program in each particular group: Commonwealth Club of California; faculty of the University of California; faculty of Stanford University; American Teachers' Union; California Teachers' Association; B'nai B'rith; California State Nurses' Association; San Francisco Music Teachers' Association; Zonta Women's Club; American Library Association; California Library Association; staff association of San Francisco Public Library; San Francisco Center—League of Women Voters; California Conference of Social Work; Social Workers' Alliance; San Francisco League of Women Shoppers; Western Consumers' Union; Jewish Community Center.

In submitting the foregoing list of organizations it is not implied that any of them are communistically dominated, but that the party maintains nuclei of one or more members in each organization for the prescribed purpose of "boring from within."

In further substantiation of Communist inroads into professional groups, the attention of the committee is respectfully directed to Youth Exhibit No. 22, which lists on page 46 the numbers of 14 professional sections.

A careful examination of the foregoing data and attached exhibits proves conclusively the alliance which exists between and among the professional groups, which have been made the subjects of this brief. There has purposely been omitted any reference to the American Newspaper Guild and to the National Lawyers' Guild, which operate on a national basis, and with whose activities the committee is undoubtedly familiar. Suffice it to say that both of these latter organizations cooperate fully with the groups which are included in this brief.

Mr. STARNES. Have you a summary that you wish to make?

Mr. NIMMO. I do not think it is necessary, Mr. Chairman. I think you are quite familiar with it.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Knowles, I understand that your committee in making your investigations and researches compiled a considerable amount of information concerning un-American and subversive activities by aliens?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. If there is any statement that you care to submit for the benefit of the committee, we will be glad to hear it.

ALIENS BRIEF—FOREWORD

Mr. KNOWLES. That officials of the United States Government have not only condoned alien offensives against our country and its Constitution, but that such officials have notoriously aided and abetted the "enemy within our gates" is established in the following brief and accompanying exhibits.

INTRODUCTION

In presenting to the committee statements and substantiating evidence with respect to the operations of the Department of Immigration and Naturalization, under the control of Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins, it is definitely and specifically charged that Secretary Perkins has been guilty of dereliction of duty in her failure to carry out the laws of the country which in her assumption of office she solemnly assumed and swore to fulfill. Her coddling of alien criminals and offenders against the laws of our land is so notorious that some evidence must already have been presented to your committee. The situation as affecting California, however, is one concerning which we can speak with definite knowledge and authority, and if the same conditions apply throughout the United States there is reflected upon the administration of Secretary Perkins gross malfeasance of office.

In making the foregoing statements we fully realize the seriousness of the charges. On the other hand, the evidence presented is believed to be highly conclusive.

There is one phase of this break-down of law enforcement to which the attention of the committee is respectfully directed, and that is the effect upon the morale of the employees of the Naturalization and Immigration Service. Conscientious workers in that Service have been thwarted in their efforts to enforce the laws by the dictation of the Secretary of Labor and her subordinates, who seem to feel that decisions of the United States courts are merely to be brushed aside when it suits their purposes to do so.

We urge upon the committee a careful study of all of the ensuing presentation and accompanying exhibits to the end that if the committee is convinced of the accuracy of our charges it may bring the matter before the next session of Congress in order that impeachment or similar proceedings be brought against the Secretary of Labor.

As further evidence of her failure to discharge the duties of her position, the attention of the committee is here directed to the fact that for the past 5 years Secretary of Labor Perkins has withheld the deportation of 2,862 aliens in the expectation that Congress will revise our immigration and naturalization laws. It is submitted that she was appointed to discharge the duties of her office and not to use her own discretion in matters of law. Exhibit No. 1 refers to this instance and is a reprint of a speech given by Hon. Robert R. Reynolds, of North Carolina, on March 12, 1936.

There is submitted as exhibit No. 2 for the consideration of the committee a press release of April 15, 1936, in which the apathetic attitude of the Department of Labor is referred to.

MARINE WORKERS INDUSTRIAL UNION

During the 1934 general strike in San Francisco, police officials raided several headquarters of radical groups, including the offices of the Marine Workers Industrial Union, membership in which, according to the decision in the case of *Murdock v. Clark* (53 Fed. (2d) 155), the circuit court of appeals held was sufficient grounds for deportation. Approximately 200 of the arrestees were alien members of the Marine Workers Industrial Union, but because of the

arbitrary order issued by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization on March 15, 1934, to the effect that such membership did not in the opinion of the Solicitor for the Department constitute grounds for deportation, local inspectors of the Immigration Service were powerless to bring about any deportation proceedings. Many of these arrestees are still exerting their all to the end of continuing industrial turmoil on the Pacific coast, while the Department of Labor idly twiddles its thumbs and thumbs its nose at patriotic citizens who want to know why.

Mr. STARNES. You charge, then, that the Secretary of Labor has arbitrarily withheld deportation proceedings against hundreds of alien members who are deportable under the law and under the decisions of the courts?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Merely under the—

Mr. KNOWLES. Opinion of the Solicitor of the Department.

Mr. STARNES. Under the thin cloak of legal protection afforded her by a solicitor in her own Department?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

This situation was called to the attention of the late Commissioner MacCormack in a letter addressed to him under date of February 17, 1936, a copy of which is submitted as exhibit No. 3.

There is also submitted as exhibit No. 4 a list of aliens arrested during the marine and general strikes of 1934. This list was taken from the police court docket and while a few of the offenders later established American citizenship, the countries of their nationality were given by them at the time of booking. It is also true that three or four out of several hundred listed were subsequently deported, but the Executive order relative to membership in the Marine Workers Industrial Union and other T. U. U. L. organizations prevented a cleaning up of several hundred undesirable aliens.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, out of this list of several hundred names which you offer here as an exhibit, you say that practically all of them are aliens?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir; or were at the time of booking.

Mr. STARNES. Some of them later were able to establish definitely that they were American citizens. However, the information was information which they themselves had furnished the police department?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. You further charge that only three or four out of this group were deported?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

FILIPINO REPATRIATION

One of the most ludicrous and expensive cases of maladministration on the part of the Department of Labor in its handling of aliens concerns the repatriation of Filipinos. While it is true that this repatriation measure was legally established as a possible means to rid this country of unemployed and unemployable Filipinos, the method of its operation was such that the measure in itself became a laughing stock for anyone who was even remotely familiar with the method in which it operated.

The repatriation measure provided a splendid opportunity at Government expense for long sea-voyage vacations of favored members of the Immigration Department. The measure did not provide for guards, and as the guards traveled first class and the repatriates were third-class passengers, it requires a tremendous stretch of the imagination to establish just what "guarding" these repatriates meant. In the first place, they departed of their own accord; therefore no guard was necessary.

One of those junketing trips was enjoyed by Commissioner of Immigration Edward F. Cahill, who combined this voyage with his honeymoon. As to whether Mrs. Cahill's expenses were also taken care of by the Government no information is available, but this question might be made the subject of an inquiry.

Taking up specifically Cahill's trip to Manila, there is presented to the committee the following information in support of the utter fallacy of the method in which the repatriation measure operates.

Cahill left San Francisco on the steamship *President Hoover* on February 6, 1937, with a contingent of 15 repatriates, for which the steamship company was paid \$90 each, or a total of \$1,350.

Inasmuch as Commissioner Cahill receives a salary of approximately \$500 a month, and because of the fact that the round trip requires approximately 2 months, the Government was put to the expense of his salary for that period, which approximated \$1,000.

First-class passenger accommodations which were purchased for Commissioner Cahill were in the neighborhood of \$500.

Commissioner Cahill was allowed expenses at the rate of \$6 a day for approximately 60 days, or \$360. The total expense, therefore, figures \$1,860 for these items.

This supervisory expense of \$1,860 for a one-man guard should be compared to a total cost of \$1,350 for the actual cost of repatriating 15 Filipinos.

Commissioner Cahill is not the only member of the local staff of the Immigration and Naturalization Service who has availed himself of a vacation at Government expense, and while the faults which have developed from an attempt to operate the repatriation bill cannot be laid at the door of the Department of Labor, nevertheless, its subordinates can be charged with bilking the United States Government.

It is urgently recommended to the committee that Commissioner Cahill be called upon for a complete report of all repatriation groups which have embarked from the port of San Francisco.

Since Commissioner Houghteling assumed office the practice of providing "guards" for repatriates has been discontinued.

SAN FRANCISCO IMMIGRATION DEPARTMENT

While it is unquestionably true that the operation of the Department under local Commissioner Cahill is to a large extent guided by the regulations emanating from Washington, at the same time the local commissioner has so conducted himself in his failure to discharge his duties as to render him subject to a thorough interrogation and investigation.

The attention of the committee is directed to the fact that where a complaint is filed with the Department of Immigration as to the

citizenship status of any individual, the matter receives investigation; however, in the case of one Harry Bridges, referred to in a special section of this report, notwithstanding numerous complaints filed with the local immigration authorities asking for an investigation of Bridges' right to remain in this country, the local commissioner failed to take any action. Furthermore, it can be definitely established that Bridges called on Commissioner Cahill and spent more than an hour and a half in the office of the latter. The commissioner personally is without authority of investigation. No inspectors were present at this meeting, which was a private conference between Cahill and Bridges. This information, while circumstantial insofar as what went on behind the scenes is concerned, was, nevertheless, of particular interest as affecting the local office of the Immigration Department in connection with its failure to investigate Harry Bridges.

Mr. STARNES. You mean that the local immigration office in California never attempted any investigation of his status?

Mr. KNOWLES. The warrant was applied for by the Seattle office.

DISCLOSURE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

For several years it has been the practice of the American Legion to furnish to the local division of the Immigration and Naturalization Service information concerning the activities, nationalities, and antecedents of those aliens who violated not only our hospitality but also our immigration and naturalization laws. Invariably it was found that this information was passed on to the American Civil Liberties Union or the International Labor Defense or some other radical organizations, to be used for the benefit of the parties concerned. In other words, confidence, instead of being respected, was abused and the information which the Labor Department secured through efforts of patriotic citizens was actually used as a weapon against the organizations supplying such information. This is rather a drastic statement, but it can be definitely established. There are, therefore, presented to the committee in proof of these allegations the following exhibits:

Exhibits Nos. 5 and 6, which are copies of the Pacific Coast Longshoremen of October 19 and 26, 1936, both of which issues contain extracts from confidential information supplied to the Department of Immigration by the American Legion. It is pertinent to inquire from what source these publications secured this information.

Mr. STARNES. Did the American Legion issue any public statement with reference to the information given here prior to its publication in these radical papers?

Mr. KNOWLES. They were seen there for the first time in public print.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, the American Legion, in the course of its investigations, came into possession of certain pertinent facts in reference to the illegal activities of Harry Bridges and other aliens on the Pacific coast which would warrant their deportation.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. And that information was furnished to such organizations as the American Civil Liberties Union or the International Labor Defense.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And later became public knowledge through publication in the so-called radical publications.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Is that your statement?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Exhibit No. 7: Issue of the Pacific Weekly of October 26, 1936. This publication was formerly issued at Carmel, Calif., and in its essence and nature was highly radical. It has since ceased publication.

Here again is an illustration where information furnished to the Department of Immigration and Naturalization was violated and turned over to certain radical elements for their own nefarious purposes.

Exhibit No. 8: Copy of a report—partial in its nature in that it does not answer specific points, but only the ones that it can conveniently do so, and which relates to several communications that the Department of Labor had received from the American Legion may be construed as a complete break-down of all immigration and naturalization law enforcement.

It was not a coincidence that Commissioner Edward F. Cahill was in southern California during the 1936 convention of the American Legion and that he personally took upon himself the responsibility for handing to men in key positions in the American Legion a copy of the confidential report submitted to the Department of Labor by its solicitors in connection with allegations which had been made by the American Legion.

May we pause for a moment to remind the committee that the very essence of voluntary cooperation on the part of citizens in the enforcement of our immigration and naturalization laws is one of essential confidence and that any breach of that confidence destroys the entire structure. It causes a citizen to hesitate in reporting violations of the law for fear of recriminations, in addition to which, it also furnishes the enemy with full information as to exactly what the United States Government does know against him and permits him to prepare his defense accordingly.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know how that information got out, or under whose orders and instructions it was given out?

Mr. KNOWLES. The report was first circulated, to my knowledge, during the progress of the American Legion convention in Hollywood, in 1936, and that later appeared in those publications.

Mr. STARNES. Who circulated it?

Mr. KNOWLES. I cannot say as to that; I do not know.

Mr. STARNES. Did the Legion disseminate that knowledge?

Mr. KNOWLES. We know that certain individuals had it.

We respectfully ask the committee to check the authenticity of the confidential opinion, signed by Messrs. Brown, Finucane and Savoretti, which is used as Exhibit No. 9, and copies of which opinion were, as above stated, passed to laymen members of the American Legion for the purpose of defeating any proposed criticism by that body of the Department of Labor. It will not be attempted at this time to answer the false charges and allegations contained in this opinion. The point which it is desired that the committee take due cognizance of is that such a confidential communication would be handed out to laymen by Commissioner Cahill or any other governmental officer who has sworn to fulfill the duties of his office.

Attention of the committee is directed to a clipping from The American Citizen of April 29, 1936, submitted as Exhibit No. 10, relating to disclosure of confidential information in the Ferrero-Sallitto cases and referred to in this section of the report.

UNDESIRABLE ALIENS ADMITTED TO THIS COUNTRY

Among Communist and Anarchist aliens who have been granted temporary passports in this country in direct violation of the laws and of previously established regulations, the following are mentioned:

Lola de la Torriente, French Communist; Emma Goldman, notorious Anarchist; John Strachey, English Communist; Kanju Kato, Japanese Communist; Toyo Kagawa, Japanese Communist; Henry Barbusse, French Communist.

In the case of Kagawa, this man was a sufferer from trachoma and, as far as can be ascertained, is the first visitor to our shores suffering from this disease who was permitted to land on American soil.

In each of the cases above referred to, protests were filed with the Department of Labor against the admission of these individuals, but without avail.

Mr. STARNES. You, of course, are aware of the fact that we have already had testimony before the committee that some of these parties were admitted to this country on presentation of a petition addressed to the Department of Labor by radical leaders and Communists in this country, instigated by the Communist Party.

Mr. KNOWLES. It will be recalled that Emma Goldman was expelled from this country because of her anarchistic activities, yet the Department of Labor permitted her reentry.

In the case of John Strachey, this man is now being billed for another tour of the United States for the promulgation of his Communistic ideology.

RADICAL PORTUGUESE AND ITALIAN ALIENS

Guiseppe Grecco was arrested in 1932 and a warrant of deportation was issued by the Department of Labor. It was alleged that Grecco was a member of the Trade Union Unity League, which he admitted to immigration inspectors. Later, however, he changed his testimony and claimed that he was not a member. Grecco's attorney applied for a writ of habeas corpus, which was denied both by the district court and the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Without any explanation the Department of Labor arbitrarily cancelled the order of deportation and Grecco was released.

In or about September of 1931 four Portugese were arrested in Stockton as members of the Marine Workers' Industrial Union, the names of these men being:

Frank Acosta, Joaquin Nunes Allegretti, Francisco Sardinha, and Manuel Rodrigues.

Each of the men carried a membership book in the Marine Workers' Industrial Union, in which it was stated that the Marine Workers' Industrial Union was affiliated with the T. U. U. L., and contained

in the membership books were the following statements, which were included in the preamble:

Victory in this struggle can only be won by the most relentless, militant, and revolutionary struggle of the whole working class.

The M. W. I. U. urges upon all its members the most active participation in the general struggle of the working class, economic and political, directed toward the goal of the establishment of a revolutionary workers' government.

In the cases of the four Portugese above mentioned, warrants of deportation were issued by the Department of Labor on the grounds that they were in the United States in violation of the Immigration Act of October 16, 1918, as amended by the act of February 5, 1920, in that they were members of an organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

Attorneys representing these aliens applied for writs of habeas corpus on the ground that they did not know the type of organization with which they were affiliated. This allegation is offset by the fact that they had actually been in the United States for 10 years before their apprehension. Federal Judge Louderback denied the writ, but the attorneys for the men appealed to the Department of Labor, which canceled the warrants of deportation previously issued.

The executive order of March 15, 1934 was made retroactive to enable the Secretary of Labor to grant a haven for these radical aliens.

The court record of these Portugese cases will be found in No. 21189-L in the Southern Division of the United States District Court for Northern California. Reference to the *Grecco case* is made to 63 Federal (2d), page 863.

In 1933 six Mexicans were arrested at a meeting in Gonzales, Calif., their names being as follows:

D. Lopez, Joe Hernandez, Jose Acosta, Y. S. Fragos, John Acosta, and Ruffino Alexander.

These arrestees were all members of the Agricultural Industrial League, which was then subsidiary to the Trade Union Unity League, which fact was so stated on the membership application cards. Warrants of arrest were issued by the Department of Labor, but early in 1934 these warrants were also canceled.

Not all alien plotters against our form of government can be definitely established as members of the Communist Party. Instead, it was and is part of the Communist strategy to persuade these undesirable aliens to affiliate with some organization which is actually under its control, but which does not bear the stigma of Communism; however, in the case of *Murdock v. Clark* (53 Fed. (2d) 155), the Circuit Court of Appeals of the First District held that the Department of Labor was justified in its contention that the Trade Union Unity League was a proscribed organization within the act of October 16, 1918 as amended by the act June 5, 1920. In this case the Court's decision specifically stated that membership in the Marine Workers' Industrial Union was sufficient ground for deportation, yet the Commissioner of Immigration in an executive order issued on March 15, 1934, advised all Immigration and Naturalization districts that in conformity with an opinion of the Solicitor for those departments, membership in such organizations does not establish grounds for deportation. In other words, the Department of

Labor and its subordinates, the Department of Immigration and Naturalization, have established their own rules of conduct, regardless of the law, thus constituting a law unto themselves and for which they render no public accounting, unless it be to the Communist element, as will be further established in this report. The March 15, 1934 order above referred to is quoted in full:

To All Immigration and Naturalization Districts:

In view of a recent opinion of the Solicitor you are advised that membership in the organizations listed below does not in itself constitute grounds for the institution of deportation proceedings under the immigration laws:

National Miners Union.

Marine Workers Industrial Union.

Metal Workers Industrial League.

Tampa Tobacco Workers Industrial Union.

National Textile Workers.

International Labor Defense.

Trade Union Unity League.

Members of such organizations who themselves believe in or advocate, or who are members of organizations which believe in or advocate, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force, are subject to the institution of deportation proceedings.

The net effect of the executive fiat above quoted is that since its issuance no inspector of immigration in the United States would have the temerity to apply for a warrant of arrest and deportation of an undesirable alien unless the latter should admit membership in the Communist Party, or a belief in the overthrow of our Government by force. And even then the Department apparently uses its best efforts to defeat the aims and ends of our immigration laws instead of enforcement.

FERRERO AND SALLITTO

There are submitted as exhibit Nos. 11 and 12 copy of a letter addressed to the late Commissioner MacCormack, of April 25, 1936, with respect to the much publicized cases of Ferrero and Sallitto, and a copy of the April 1936 issue of the Anarchist publication *Man*, dealing with these cases, and to which the attention of the committee is respectfully directed. From this publication *Man* it is readily apparent that someone in the service of the Department of Immigration and Naturalization was handing to the anarchist group confidential information.

The attention of the committee is respectfully directed to two paragraphs in the letter, exhibit No. 13, protesting against the illegal dissemination of information of a confidential nature.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, the attention of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization called to the fact that information of a confidential nature furnished to him was being released to radical, Communistic and Anarchistic publications in this country; is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; the exhibit is before you.

Mr. STARNES. Was the condition complained of remedied? Did you receive any reply from the commissioner in reference to the complaints?

Mr. KNOWLES. I do not think so; it has been a one-way correspondence, mostly.

Mr. STARNES. It has been a one-way correspondence?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. That was the former commissioner, not the present commissioner.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. I believe there is a statement in this brief that certain evils complained of under the former commissioner have been remedied by Mr. Houghteling.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes. I may say in justice to Mr. Houghteling that he has replied to each letter directed to him.

Mr. STARNES. I have found Mr. Houghteling to be a very painstaking and conscientious public official.

Mr. KNOWLES. I have no criticism of Mr. Houghteling.

Mr. STARNES. He has given replies to any inquiries I have directed to him as a member of the house.

Mr. KNOWLES. In connection with Ferrero and Sallitto cases, it is also not only of interest but of some concern to learn that notwithstanding the fact that the higher courts of this country upheld the deportation of both of these men, Sallitto was released in January 1938 by order of the Department of Labor.

It is believed pertinent to inquire at this time just how far the Department of Labor can go in its arbitrary rulings and decisions which are so utterly in direct conflict with our established laws and regulations.

JACQUES GROSSMAN GUTZMAN

On May 18, 1936, Jacques Grossman Gutzman was denied admittance to the United States by the local immigration board when he arrived at this port on the steamship *Mariposo*, at San Francisco.

Grossman is a citizen of Russia, who was traveling on an ordinary Russian passport—not a diplomatic passport—his expenses, however, being paid by the Russian Government. He refused to answer questions put to him by the immigration inspectors as to whether he believed in the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence.

The Immigration Act of 1920 mandatorily excludes from admission to the United States, persons who believe in, advocate or teach the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. He was brought before a board of special inquiry, which board also excluded his entry because of his refusal to answer the question referred to as to whether he believed in the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence.

On the representation of the Russian consulate at San Francisco, Grossman was paroled to Consul Galkovitch; subsequently, he was granted a 60-day visitor's permit.

There can, of course, be no particular objection to the granting of visitors' permits unless there is something with respect to the activities of the individual which would render him ineligible for such a consideration. The point, however, which it is believed is of a high degree of importance in connection with the handling of Grossman's case is that he was undoubtedly an official representative of the Soviet Government, although he attempted to enter this country merely as a casual visitor. It was not until his apprehension that the Soviet Government took official cognizance of his identity, whereupon, as previously stated, he was released into the parole custody of the Russian consulate on orders emanating from the Department of Labor

at Washington. It subsequently developed that Grossman was visiting the United States for the purpose of investigating certain agricultural conditions in behalf of the Soviet Government, yet in keeping with the policy of duplicity and deceit which permeates our relations with that country, Grossman attempted to enter on a visitor's visa.

There is now submitted to the committee a copy of a letter sent to Senor Coolidge under date of May 22, 1936, protesting the action of the Labor Department in connection with the Grossman matter; also submitted is a clipping from the San Francisco Chronicle of May 22, 1936, which also contains a reference to the same subject. These are marked "Exhibit Nos. 14 and 15."

Also tendered as exhibit No. 16 is copy of a telegram to Senator Coolidge under date of May 21, 1936.

Deputy Commissioner Edw. J. Shaughnessy, in replying to a communication from Congressman John W. McCormack, concerning the admission of this alien, reported to the Congressman as follows:

This alien, a dairy expert in the employ of the Soviet Government, is making a study of the dairy business in many countries throughout the world. He arrived at the port of San Francisco on May 18 and applied for temporary admission for a period of 60 days. He was coming here solely for the purpose of studying the dairy industry in this country and establishing contact with supply concerns manufacturing equipment for that industry. While he applied for 60 days' temporary admission, he stated he did not expected to remain that long. He was accordingly admitted for a period of 60 days under the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917.

The foregoing letter is introduced as exhibit No. 17. Also submitted as exhibit No. 18 is copy of letter addressed to Commissioner McCormack, under date of June 15, 1936.

Submitted as exhibit No. 19 is a clipping from the American Citizens, in which a protest is made at the permission granted by the Department of Labor for this man to enter the United States.

GEORGE GEOFFREIN AND ISAAC FINKELSTEIN

Both of these men were arrested by immigration authorities upon evidence presented by the American Legion. Both Geoffrein and Finkelstein were attempting to proselyte among the armed forces of this country and were both successful in inducing soldiers in the United States Army to join the Communist Party. Geoffrein, who then had a position at Vallejo, Calif., was contacting the naval forces at Mare Island, and Finkelstein was endeavoring to destroy the morale of the forces at the Presidio of San Francisco. It is believed that full substantiation of these statements can be obtained from the intelligence branches of both the Army and the Navy. The arrests occurred the latter part of 1935, and the two men were temporarily held in the Alameda County jail until such time as the Communist organization known as the International Labor Defense appealed to the Secretary of Labor to have them released from that institution and assigned to Angel Island. While it is true that Angel Island is a logical place of detention, it has not heretofore been customary to remove pending deportees until such time as their guilt or innocence was established. However, the moment the Communist International Labor Defense interested itself in the cases of these two men, who were attempting to destroy the morale of our armed forces, the Secretary of Labor issued an order transferring them to Angel Island.

Attention is called to exhibit No. 20 protesting the action taken by the Department of Labor.

One of the contentions submitted by the I. L. D. was that these men were improperly fed at the Alameda County jail. That this statement was false could be established by Deputy Sheriff Hugo Radbruch, of Alameda County, who reported at that time that both of the men had gained weight during their incarceration, and that Finkelstein had actually increased 10 pounds in weight.

Finkelstein entered the United States illegally from Poland in 1927, and Geoffrein from Mexico in the same year; yet these two men, who had no legal standing in the country and who were exerting every effort to overthrow our Government, were "coddled" by the Department of Labor. Finkelstein has not as yet been deported because of the fact that the Departments of State and of Labor have not established reciprocal relations with Poland, the country of his nativity. Geoffrein was eventually deported to France and upon his arrival there was sentenced to a term in prison for offenses against the French Government.

The attention of the committee is directed to the fact that it has been a customary procedure to detain prospective deportees at the Alameda County jail and that there was nothing unusual about the confinement of Geoffrein and Finkelstein except their transfer to Angel Island.

Attention is also called to a press release of April 15, 1936, in connection with the abortive maner of handling the *Geoffrein* and *Finkelstein* cases.

Also tendered as exhibit No. 21 is a clipping from the American Citizen of May 15, 1936, with respect to these cases.

JACK WARNICK

This man, a native of Canada, has been in the United States since 1908. He was arrested by the immigration authorities on October 3, 1935, while employed as a clerk in the State administrator's office of the Works Progress Administration. Warnick has a long record of arrests for Communist activities, one of the most recent being in 1934, when he was arrested with other Sacramento, Calif., radicals on a charge of criminal syndicalism. He was not, however, convicted on this particular charge, and continued his Communist activities. He was formerly well known as a member of the Communist Party, but because of his leanings toward the Trotsky element he was dismissed from the party, according to the Western Worker of May 9, 1935. Subsequently, in 1936, Warnick was employed as an artist carver on the W. P. A. Federal theater project in San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, here is a case of a known Communist who was employed in the office of the State administrator of the Works Progress Administration, as a clerk there, who was, at the time of his employment, arrested by the Department of Immigration.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And you further find that this same Communist was employed as an artist carver by the Federal theater project in San Francisco?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. You may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLES. Upon his arrest by the immigration authorities in October 1935, Warnick was released on \$1,000 bail furnished by the American Civil Liberties Union. A warrant of deportation was issued in the *Warnick case*, despite which he was permitted to remain on the W. P. A. pay roll for a period of approximately 1 year. Then, when each alien was required to produce his first papers, which Warnick could not do, he was discharged. At that time the American Civil Liberties Union demanded that his bail be released because of the fact that he could not be deported to Canada.

In connection with the *Warnick case* there is an interesting sidelight in that when Congress enacted a provision to the effect that aliens could not be employed on W. P. A. projects, he was, nevertheless, carried for more than a year beyond the effective date of that law, and it was then only after repeated protests had been made to the W. P. A. authorities that he was released. In other words, for a long period of time Warnick was deriving from the United States Government the funds with which to carry on his own fight to avoid deportation proceedings.

Exhibit No. 22 consists of two clippings from the American Citizen in relation to the *Warnick case*.

F. J. McCONNEL

The method of the Department of Labor in the handling of the application for citizenship of F. J. McConnell (Francis Jordan McConnell) is particularly offensive to American citizens who are at all familiar with the circumstances.

This man was born in Australia and in August 1934 was a member of the executive committee of the Emergency Defense Committee, a Communist organization. In September 1934, when one Ed Royce was arrested for his Communist activities, McConnell cabled to Australia for \$1,000, which he received and was posted as bail for Royce. When he was later questioned by the naturalization inspectors as to the party to whom he had paid this \$1,000 he professed that he did not recall. McConnell is not a man of sufficient means to casually hand such a sum of money to some individual whose name he could not later recall, as for some period of time he was carried on relief and W. P. A. projects. He has been active in many Communist organizations, such as the Conference for Labor's Civil Rights, Inter-Professional Committee, American League Against War and Fascism, Committee of Action, Trade Union Unity League, Conference for Repeal of the Criminal Syndicalism Act, All Unions Committee, International Labor Defense, Teachers' Union, and so forth.

Taking advantage of the provisions of our naturalization laws permitting men who fought with the allied forces to be granted citizenship without awaiting the statutory period required of others, McConnell filed his application on August 23, 1935. This application was contested by a group of patriotic American citizens, and when the application, hearing on which was several times postponed, was finally brought before Federal Judge Londerback at San Francisco on June 15, 1937, it was denied on the ground that McConnell was not attached to the principles of the United States Government.

Notwithstanding a preponderance of evidence of the radical activities of McConnell, the late Commissioner of Immigration and Naturali-

zation, MacCormack, issued a letter to the local naturalization authorities instructing them that, because of the controversial nature of McConnell's application, the examiner should refrain from making any recommendation. This was in direct violation of our national statutes, and when the case was called before Federal Judge Louderback he asked the examiner why no recommendation for or against the granting of citizenship had been made, and was informed that the said examiner was acting under instructions from the department at Washington. Judge Louderback then called the examiner's attention to the provisions of the naturalization laws which make it obligatory for the examiner to make a recommendation and instructed him, as an attaché of the court, to submit a definite recommendation in the matter. Under these circumstances the examiner then recommended against the granting of citizenship, which was, of course, denied.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, here again you have an administrative order in the Department of Labor given in direct contravention of existing law.

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right, the statute requiring the examiner to make a recommendation or report to the court.

Mr. STARNES. The statute required him?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; and the central office telling them not to make it.

Mr. STARNES. The central office issuing an administrative order ordering them not to make such a report or recommendation?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. You may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLES. The point at issue here, however, is that the Department of Labor again established itself as being the judge and jury and issued an executive order in violation of the provisions of our laws.

The basis of approach to Commissioner MacCormack is, of course, one of mere conjecture, but so far as can be ascertained, his action in this case was without precedent.

The attention of the committee is respectfully directed to a copy of letter written by Commissioner MacCormack to Congresswoman Kahn under date of September 8, 1936, submitted as exhibit No. 23, and to the attached clipping (exhibit No. 24) in relation to the McConnell matter.

WILLIAM SCHNEIDERMAN

This man is now and has been for several years the secretary of district 13 of the Communist Party, which comprises the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada. Schneiderman, who was born in Russia, took out papers of citizenship on June 10, 1927, at which time he naturally took an oath of allegiance to the United States. That he did so, however, with tongue in cheek is evidenced by the fact that he was for years prior thereto and since the date of granting of citizenship actively identified with the Communist Party. Reference is hereby directed to a publication known as "New Frontiers," which was issued by the California Young Communist League in 1937, on page 26 of which appears the following reference to his having joined the Young Communist League in 1922, 5 years prior to his application for citizenship. The publication, *New Frontier*, is submitted as exhibit No. 22 in the youth section of this report.

Not only did Schneiderman falsify insofar as his allegiance to this country is concerned, but it is definitely believed that he failed to

disclose a criminal record. At the tender age of 14, Schneiderman was sentenced to Sing Sing prison on a charge of receiving stolen goods—No. B, 65013, September 1914. A copy of a portion of Schneiderman's history is tendered as exhibit No. 25, and a group of letters exchanged with the United States Attorney and the Department of Immigration and Naturalization in connection with the *Schneiderman case* are incorporated as exhibit No. 26.

The attention of the committee is respectfully directed to the fact that on December 2, 1937, the assistant district director of the Los Angeles District of Immigration and Naturalization Service, in response to an inquiry as to the disposition of the *Schneiderman case*, advised that the matter had been submitted to the central office in Washington, where it was then being considered. This case had previously been reported to the Immigration authorities a year prior thereto. Receiving no action from the Immigration authorities, the matter was then taken up with the United States attorney in San Francisco, who advised under date of February 28, 1938, that:

When the matter of the naturalization of William Schneiderman is officially called to the attention of this office, I will give it my immediate and careful consideration.

It was apparent from the foregoing that the United States attorney could take no action except upon complaint of the Department of Labor, and a communication was then addressed to the Assistant District Director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service on February 25, 1938, making inquiry as to the disposition or action taken. Again it was stated that the matter was receiving the attention of the central office in Washington. A further letter was written to Director Armstrong on August 22, asking what action had been taken, to which he replied under date of August 23, 1938, to the effect that there had been no change in connection with the Schneiderman proceedings. Subsequently, on August 31, 1938, Assistant Director Armstrong advised that information had just been received from Washington to the effect that the *Schneiderman case* was being given most careful attention and that every possible effort would be made to have the question of citizenship properly adjudicated.

It is respectfully submitted to the committee that the entire handling of this *Schneiderman case* was merely a smokescreen on the part of officials of the Department of Labor, who have no intention whatever of enforcing the law in the case of the executive head of the Communist Party in California, who obtained his citizenship status through fraud and misrepresentation. Certainly it should not take more than a year and a half for the Department of Labor to ascertain whether or not a man obtained his citizenship papers fraudulently.

Submitted as exhibit No. 27 is a clipping from the American Citizen relating to Schneiderman.

HAROLD J. PRITCHETT

Harold J. Pritchett, president of the International Woodworkers' Federation, and a citizen of British Columbia, was reported in this country to be an active member in high standing of the Communist Party. He has been granted repeated visas by the Department of Labor to visit the United States in the furtherance of his program of

disrupting the lumber industry in this country. Repeated protests to the Department of Labor have proved unavailing, as Pritchett is given carte blanche to visit this country whenever he desires to do so and to remain as long as he wishes. Representatives of the United States Government in British Columbia refused to recommend Pritchett for a passport, but the Department of Labor with its usual flagrant violation of law and of equity assumed responsibility for his admission over the protests of our British Columbia representative.

MR. STARNES. It is your charge, then, that our representatives in British Columbia failed to recommend him for admission, but notwithstanding that the Department of Labor admitted him?

MR. KNOWLES. Ordered him admitted. Chairman Dies mentioned that matter yesterday afternoon, and read some matters into the record in connection with it.

MR. STARNES. You may proceed.

In substantiation of the foregoing statements, we submit herewith exhibit No. 28, consisting of three news items in connection with Pritchett's movements. There is also submitted as exhibit No. 29 copy of a letter written on March 16, 1938, by the President of the Associated Farmers of California to Secretary of Labor Perkins, protesting to the continued readmissions of Pritchett, from which there is quoted the concluding paragraph, which, it is believed, reflects popular sentiment on the Pacific coast insofar as the maladministration of the Department of Labor is concerned:

It is a sad commentary upon the enforcement of our laws when a person who has been denied admission by local authorities is later granted the right to enter the United States merely because he has gone through the routine of crossing the border into Canada and secures the approval of the Secretary of Labor to again reenter the United States in the face of definite recommendations to the contrary by the local authorities.

HERNON GONZALES

This man was apprehended by the immigration authorities in March 1938 as an undesirable alien affiliated with an organization which advocated the violent overthrow of the United States Government. He was held at Angel Island for a period of 6 months and was then released on his own recognizance in September 1938 because of the fact that the Department of Labor did not wish to proceed with the prosecution of this case until the *Strecker case* was settled. Several patriotic citizens furnished conclusive evidence to the Immigration Department with respect to Gonzales that not only was he a member of the Communist Party, but that he personally believed in the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. Either his original apprehension was erroneous or his subsequent release was. In other words, it took the Department of Labor 6 months to find out whether they wanted to hold this man or not.

From all the information which is obtainable, it is definitely believed that he should be deported, but the immigration authorities may find it difficult to locate him if, as and when they finally decide to interest themselves in ridding this country of undesirable radicals. In the meantime, the Communist Party, through its attorney representing Gonzales, was furnished with a complete record of the case, including names of witnesses, and so forth, which action on the part

of the Immigration Department rendered such witnesses liable to personal persecution and retaliation.

Mr. STARNES. You charge, then, that confidential information given to the Department of Labor with reference to the illegal activities of the Communist involved in this case was handed to the representatives of the Communist Party.

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. You may proceed.

JUAN DIAZ

Mr. KNOWLES. This man in 1934 was the general head of the Mexican branches of the Communist Party. He was also the San Francisco district organizer of the Communist United Farmers League. In December 1934 he was indicted by the Federal grand jury for perjury in connection with his entry into the United States. After his conviction in March 1935, and the serving of an 18-month sentence at McNeill's Island, he was remanded to the custody of the immigration authorities for deportation to Spain. The latter failed to deport him, however, on the ground that Diaz could not be sent back to Spain because of the civil war there, although the Spanish consul had issued a passport for him.

In addition to his arrest on the perjury charge, Diaz was apprehended on various criminal charges in many parts of the State of California. Due to the apathy of the Labor Department he remains at liberty to pursue his Communist activities, and because of the generosity of charitable agencies his wife and seven children have become public charges upon the community.

Clipping from the San Francisco Examiner of June 2, 1936, is attached as exhibit No. 30.

It is a matter of public knowledge that 2,000 American citizens have been able to reach Spain within the past 2 years to engage in the Loyalist cause, and that there are direct sailings from England to Loyalist Spain. It is readily apparent that there would have been no difficulty in enforcing the order of deportation against Diaz.

JOHN PAULICH

In March 1938 a sworn statement was submitted to the local immigration authorities by a member of the American Legion, who is a disabled war veteran, to the effect that he had been approached by Paulich, who attempted to induce him to join the Communist Party. Paulich frankly stated that one of the reasons for his approach was the fact that this former service man was an ex-machine gunner who served with the United States forces in Siberia in 1918, and stated that he and all other machine gunners were needed in the cause of the revolution.

No action was taken in the case, nor was Paulich arrested.

These conversations occurred in March of 1938; and even if the *Strecker case* might affect others, it could have no bearing whatever in the Paulich case, as this man admittedly subscribes to the overthrow of the United States Government by violence.

Mr. STARNES. Do you have any summary that you wish to make at this time, Mr. Ninmo?

Mr. NIMMO. I do not think there is anything I could say that would add to what you already know, Mr. Starnes. It is readily observable from your comments, as we have proceeded, that you have made a very thorough study of the subject and are familiar with many cases that I am not familiar with myself. I would say, however, it seems to me that this alien question is a very serious question and that conditions in the Department of Labor are in serious need of being remedied. I think that is generally accepted throughout the country, that that Department as it is run today is not only inefficient but that it is pursuing methods to which may be directly attributable this loose situation in the handling of aliens.

I think that the American Legion in presenting this has felt that it is one of the most important reports that it has to give, although, as I said this morning, the one affecting the food supply we consider just as important, perhaps more.

Mr. Chairman, we have, I think, two other briefs. One is upon the labor-union question. I believe Mr. Knowles' idea is that while that takes up the subject of communism in the labor union group, it covers that group which was not affiliated with the maritime group, which we covered on yesterday.

I do not know whether you feel you want to give the time to go through that thoroughly. We can file the briefs, if you so desire, and let it go at that, or we shall be very glad to pursue it as you say.

Then we have one other brief, the political brief. Those two, I think, could be disposed of maybe in a morning's session.

Mr. STARNES. I am going to suggest that the matter of the inclusion of those briefs be left to the chairman, Mr. Dies. We have had rather exhaustive hearings on communism in the trade unions, at the beginning of our hearings. I am quite sure that while you have some valuable information it would probably serve its purpose if it were merely incorporated in the record.

However, I am not going to pass on that myself and will suggest that you present the matter to the chairman for a final decision. We will not have the time to go into any further phases of un-American and subversive activities with Mr. Knowles this afternoon.

The chairman, Mr. Dies, will be presiding again in the morning. I understand there are probably some other witnesses available whom we can hear. Again I will state that I am authorized to announce that Mr. Homer Martin will testify before the committee on Thursday of this week with reference to un-American activities in the trade-union movement.

I think it would be best, as I have said, to defer the decision on the matter of your other briefs until tomorrow.

We will recess at this time until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. (Whereupon a recess was taken until Wednesday, October 26, 1938, at 10 a. m.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1938

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Before we proceed with the testimony this morning, the Chair wishes to read into the record the following statement:

After reading the President's statement, I desire to make a more detailed reply. As I stated last night, I have known from the beginning that neither the President nor his advisers favored this investigation. The Departments not only refused to comply with the request of Congress that our committee be supplied with adequate personnel, but they have thrown every obstacle in the way of a successful investigation. This campaign was aided by Members of the Cabinet. The Shirley Temple fabrication was conceived by certain radical writers whose sympathies for Soviet Russia are matters of common knowledge. Immediately, and as if by prearrangement, Secretary Perkins and Secretary Ickes repeated this crude and silly fabrication, thus hoping to lend the color of truth and respectability. Even the President was induced to refer to the Shirley Temple fabrication in one of his press conferences. When this campaign utterly failed and recoiled upon the heads of those who conceived and engineered it, the next move was to exert every conceivable pressure to stifle this investigation. When this likewise failed, as a last desperate move, the President was induced to permit the prestige of his great office to be used for the purpose of discrediting the investigation.

That the President has been wholly misinformed is obvious from his statement. Of course, the President did not hear the testimony and has not read the record. He is evidently relying upon reports that have reached him from prejudiced sources. Had he read the testimony he would have found that Democrats testified the same as Republicans, and that some of the testimony came from former officials of the U. A. W. He would have also found that the principal witness was Lieutenant Mulbar, chief of the State police, who holds a civil-service position and is absolutely nonpartisan. In this connection I wish to say that our investigator spent 2 months in Detroit with instructions to conduct a fearless investigation. As a

result of 2 months' work on the ground, he subpoenaed these witnesses independent of the question of politics, so that when the President states that the committee made no effort to get at the truth he is obviously misinformed. He is likewise misinformed when he says that we "did not call for facts to support personal opinion." The evidence which we received would be acceptable in any court, and if the President has any doubt about this I suggest that he appoint some experienced lawyer and I will do likewise. Then the two can appoint a third and together they can examine all of the evidence with reference to the Michigan situation and then report to the country as to whether or not this evidence was competent and admissible.

I have stated many times that every individual or organization against whom a charge or attack was made during the course of these hearings had a standing invitation to appear before the committee to disprove such charge or attack. In adopting this policy, the committee has shown itself absolutely fair.

The testimony with reference to the Michigan situation showed very clearly that the well-known Communists instigated and engineered the sit-down strike and the so-called Lansing holiday, when a mob of 15,000 people barricaded the State capitol and 2,000 of them, many of whom were armed with clubs, were ordered to march on the university and to bring part of it back with them. The evidence shows that the State police sat helplessly by for lack of instructions from the Governor in the face of open rebellion, while the Governor looked down upon the scene from a window in the capitol. It cannot be disputed that misdemeanors and felonies were committed on that disgraceful day under the very eyes of the Governor, who had sworn to uphold law and order. If open and undisguised rebellion is to be countenanced in the name of political expediency, then constitutional democracy will perish in America.

The people of this country are entitled to know the truth. As chairman of this committee, I have felt it my duty to conduct a fearless investigation, regardless of political expediency. Under my conception of public duty, it would have been wrong to shield Governor Murphy simply because he was a Democrat and a strong friend of the President. While I deeply regret the President's bitter attack on a congressional committee of an independent department of the Government, and while I regret that the President did not read the testimony before issuing this statement, I wish to make it plain that I shall continue to do my duty undeterred and unafraid.

You gentlemen have a brief to submit with reference to the political situation on the west coast, have you not?

TESTIMONY OF HARPER L. KNOWLES AND RAY E. NIMMO—

Continued

MR. KNOWLES. We have one brief on the infiltration of radical unions, other than the Maritime Union, and also a brief on the political situation.

THE CHAIRMAN. We will take up the political brief this afternoon, because I want an opportunity to go over it before you submit it.

Are the statements contained in your briefs substantiated by affidavits and statements of witnesses available to this committee?

Mr. KNOWLES. The affidavits are not all here. They are on the west coast. We can substantiate everything we say by testimony on the west coast.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a brief dealing with the infiltration of Communists into the labor movement?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose we continue with that in just a moment.

The Chair is very anxious to find out from Mr. Cahill, the district immigration commissioner, what he meant when he made the statement in a letter, "Now that we have buried the *Bridges case*." The Chair does not know whether the committee can afford to subpoena him, but the chairman is instructing the secretary of the committee to communicate with Mr. Cahill and obtain an explanation of his statement in that letter.

Before proceeding with your testimony, the Chair wishes to place this statement in the record.

The chairman has examined the record of appeal in the *Bridges case*; that is, the appeal to the Supreme Court, and it appears that in September 1938, Robert H. Jackson, Solicitor General of the United States, filed a petition for a writ of certiorari in the Supreme Court of the United States, in which he states that the question presented to the Supreme Court is "Whether the Court below erred in failing to sustain an order of deportation against respondent, an alien who in 1932 became a member of the Communist Party of the United States."

The "Specifications of Error to be Urged" by Mr. Jackson are:

The Circuit Court of Appeals erred: 1. In holding that an alien who in 1932 became a member of the Communist Party is not by reason of that fact subject to deportation under the act of October 18, 1918, as amended by the act of June 5, 1920 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 137); 2. In holding that the evidence before the Secretary of Labor concerning the principles of the Communist Party was insufficient to sustain the order of deportation; 3. In remanding the case for a trial de novo in the district court; 4. In failing to affirm the judgment of the district court.

The agreed statement contained in Mr. Jackson's petition for a writ of certiorari—page 5—omits the finding of Turner W. Battle, Assistant to the Secretary of Labor, in the deportation warrant that Strecker would be deported "in that he believes in and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States"—although this point was urged by the United States Attorney in his petition for rehearing—and includes only the fact that "after his entry he was found (R. 114-115) to have become a member of one of the classes of aliens enumerated in section 1 of the act, as amended, to-wit:

an alien who is a member of or affiliated with an organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, or teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

In other words, in the agreed statement in the petition for a writ of certiorari, Mr. Jackson has omitted an important finding by the Assistant to the Secretary of Labor in the deportation warrant; and apparently seeks to narrow the issues on appeal to the question of membership in the Communist Party of the United States.

The petition for writ of certiorari—page 10—shows that Strecker filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in the United States Dis-

trict Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas in June 1936, based on the same ground as the instant application (R. 9), and after a hearing before Judge Martineau the petition was denied and an appeal allowed. This appeal was never perfected but was docketed and dismissed in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. Thereafter, on June 16, 1937, the present proceedings were begun by Strecker in the District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Now, if you will proceed with your brief, we will be glad to hear you.

Mr. KNOWLES. In presenting the annexed statement with respect to Communist Party activities in labor unions, it is not the intent that this should cover the national aspects of such activities, nor that the information submitted is all inclusive insofar as the Pacific coast is concerned; only the most outstanding instances of Communist infiltration are presented.

COMMUNISTS IN LABOR UNIONS

Coincident with the dismemberment of the Communist Trade Union Unity League, there was established the Committee for Industrial Organization, and while it is not the intent to claim or to imply that all members affiliated with this organization are Communists or even Communist sympathizers, the facts of the matter, as evidenced by information which is undoubtedly already in the hands of the committee, will indicate conclusively that a large percentage of the officers and organizers of the C. I. O. are members of the Communist Party.

Feeling confident that the committee is fully aware of the national situation, it will be the purpose of this report to cover in the main the principal activities of the Communist Party in the labor union movement on the Pacific coast as distinguished from the national aspects.

It may be stated, parenthetically, that notwithstanding the fact that the principal Communist activities in the labor movements occur within the C. I. O. ranks, there are nevertheless a large number of Communist members in the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, whose purpose in retaining such affiliations is to continue with the announced Communist policy of "boring from within", as dictated by the Communist International from Moscow. It is the avowed purpose of the Communist Party to control the labor movement. If, therefore, they maintain positions of power within the C. I. O. and infiltrate into the A. F. of L., they can then, if successful, either bring about the dissolution of the A. F. of L. or its affiliation with the C. I. O. under Communist leadership. That this condition was recognized by leaders of the labor movement in the United States several years ago is evidenced by exhibit No. 2, which is a reprint of an article by Matthew Woll, third vice president of the American Federation of Labor, which appeared in Liberty Magazine of July 21, 1934.

An outline of the plan of campaign to accomplish the orders of the Communist International is covered in the clipping from the American Citizen of December 13, 1935, submitted as exhibit No. 3.

Indicative of the progress of the Communist-inspired labor revolt,

there is submitted as exhibit No. 4 a reprint from the San Diego Labor Leader of January 1936.

Such rapid progress was made within the trade union movement by the Communists that it was soon recognized by conservative American labor leaders. As indicating this recognition, there is submitted as exhibit No. 5, clippings quoting official publications or statements of various labor unions in opposition to communism and the C. I. O., which organizations soon became in the minds of the public synonymous.

In substantiation of the charge that it was a part of the Communist plan to secure control of the entire labor movement, including the A. F. of L. unions, there is now tendered as exhibit No. 6, a reprint from the Labor Clarion of February 7, 1936—official weekly publication of the San Francisco Labor Council, A. F. of L.—exposing this Communist plan and which supplements the reprint from the San Diego Labor Leader heretofore submitted as exhibit No. 4.

As further evidence, reference is made to exhibit No. 7, which is a mimeographed copy of Control Tasks for building the Communist Party in California, on page 1 of which in the second paragraph, the following statement appears:

We greatly strengthened our position in important central labor bodies throughout the State and in many decisive unions, playing no little part in the C. I. O. organization drive.

It will be noted that the Control Tasks were adopted at a State committee meeting of the Communist Party held on May 9, 1937.

Reverting to the original Communist plan for control of the labor movement and the ensuing overthrow of capitalism, there is now quoted from the Communist International of April 20, 1935, page 393, the following definite statement of policy:

* * * enter the trade unions in order to make them into conscious organs of struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and for communism * * * Any voluntary abandonment of the trade-union movement, any artificial attempt to form special unions, unless this is rendered necessary by exceptional acts of violence on the part of the trade-union bureaucracy * * * or by their narrow aristocratic policy of preventing the broad masses of unskilled workers from becoming members of the organization * * * is a tremendous danger for the Communist movement.

The Communist International, January 1937 issue, outlines further the position of the Communist Party in the trade-union movement.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND THE C. I. O.

THE POSITION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

From the beginning the Communist Party in the United States of America has supported the Committee for Industrial Organization movement, with a certain amount of criticism. The Communist Party especially urged the Committee for Industrial Organization to come out more definitely for a Farmer-Labor Party, to take more energetic steps to mobilize its sympathizers in the craft unions, and to press forward more actively with the organization work. The Communist Party has been giving the Committee for Industrial Organization its energetic support in the struggle against the reactionary section of the executive council of the American Federal of Labor, and also in the prosecution of its several campaigns to organize the unorganized in the steel, auto, and other mass production industries.

The Committee for Industrial Organization leaders plan that the majority of the steel workers shall be organized in the union by the middle of February,

a not difficult task in view of the splendid opportunity for organization work at the present time. * * *

Every progressive and revolutionary element in the American labor movement is giving more or less active support to the broad struggles either initiated or supported by the Committee for Industrial Organization.

* * * The Communist Party in the United States of America will throw all its force into this sharpening struggle in order that these mass movements may turn out to be the biggest victory ever won by the American working class, the biggest step toward its unity. And so that, in the making of this victory, the Communist Party can take still further strides toward building itself into a mass party.

Alex Bittelman, nationally known Communist, in an article entitled "Communist Party in Action," stated as follows:

Members of the Communist Party must be members of trade-unions, either the revolutionary unions, affiliated to the Trade Union Unity League, or reformist unions, as the policy of the party may require.

As further evidence of the plan of the Communist Party to control the labor-union movement in the United States, there appears in International Press Correspondence of May 4, 1935, the following:

The central committee of the Communist Party in the United States of America has instructed its members in the unions to take the initiative in the struggle for the unification of the trade unions, for their organization on an industrial basis, for the organization of the unorganized, and for trade-union democracy and autonomy of the individual unions within the American Federation of Labor. The party factions are urged to work to win over the membership of the revolutionary for the struggle for unity. In order to mobilize the masses more widely for a revolutionary policy, serious explanatory work is to be carried on within the "red" unions, so they will understand the necessity for such a step and will increase their militant action in the American Federation of Labor unions.

Party Organizer, another Communist publication, in its March 1936 issue, claims a membership of 10,000 adherents of the party in the American Federation of Labor and other unions and further outlines the Communist Party program of control in the following language:

BOILING FROM WITHIN

In brief, thousands of Communists connected with millions of organized workers, together with the progressive elements amounting to tens of thousands, constitute a tremendous power, which, correctly orientated on how to bring before their fellow workers the issue of the Farmer-Labor Party, can bring about great results. The fact that wherever our comrades are active, the unions endorsed the Farmer-Labor Party, shows the big possibilities.

To organize and lead shop struggles; to build the union; to build the Communist Party; to bring party campaigns into the shop of which the major one today is the Farmer-Labor Party; to build the circulation of the Daily Worker; to increase literature sales; to take up the special problems of the Negro women and the youth; and finally, to propagandize the revolutionary way out—Soviet power.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder—this is rather lengthy. Suppose you skip some of the details and give us the highlights. Do you know the names and the number of the Communists on the west coast that are prominent in the labor movement?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes; there are some of them included in this brief. We have not endeavored to name them all, particularly as to names, but there are a few in the brief. It would run into the thousands probably.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you undertaken, as a result of this investigation, to compile any such list?

Mr. KNOWLES. We maintain a current card system in reference to the current activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The investigation which the American Legion has conducted is absolutely nonpartisan?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The American Legion is not a partisan organization?

Mr. KNOWLES. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. It is composed of members of every political party, except Communists and other radicals?

Mr. KNOWLES. We hope so.

The CHAIRMAN. A number of men have been engaged in preparing this material, in making this investigation?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. And your purpose is to render some service to the country in exposing un-American activities?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is our intention, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So that there has not been any bias or prejudice, from the partisan standpoint, that has entered into the preparation of this material?

Mr. KNOWLES. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand it, both the Democrats and Republicans have engaged in this investigation?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And this investigation has been very carefully conducted, has it not?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And as exhaustively as the combined energies, resources and talents of your membership could possibly bring to bear upon it?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You are definitely of the opinion that the Communist Party has played a very active part on the west coast in fomenting strikes and class warfare, and sit-down strikes, and in paralyzing the industrial situation; is that a fact?

Mr. KNOWLES. Very definitely.

The CHAIRMAN. You are also definitely of the opinion, as a result of this investigation, that the Communists have entered other movements besides the labor field on the west coast?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I suggest that we take a recess until 1 o'clock, so that the Chair may have an opportunity to go into this other matter contained in your other brief. It will take probably an hour or two to go into it carefully, so that we will take a recess until 1 o'clock.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The other matter concerns the charges that certain candidates for office are members of the Communist Party. The Chair wants to go into the factual situation very carefully before deciding on the question of admitting this testimony.

This committee on the west coast, which has been conducting this investigation, has a list of a large number of witnesses?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Who will testify as to all these facts?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you procured affidavits from most of these witnesses before coming here?

Mr. KNOWLES. Most of them.

The CHAIRMAN. And those witnesses are available on the west coast?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes. Our committee is the California committee. Of course, there are other like committees in the other States.

The CHAIRMAN. And those people will be available when the subcommittee goes to the west coast, for further substantiation of the preliminary report you have made to this committee.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes. We endeavored to simply high light the entire situation, and not go into detail.

The CHAIRMAN. We will take a recess until 1 o'clock.

(Thereupon, the subcommittee took a recess until 1 p. m. this day.)

AFTER RECESS

(The committee reconvened at 1 p. m., upon expiration of the recess.)

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. Before we began taking testimony this morning, the Chair read into the record a statement with reference to the appeal of the *Strecker case* to the Supreme Court. The Chair pointed out that there was an agreed statement of facts, agreed to by the Department on the one hand and Strecker's attorneys on the other. The Chair pointed out that one of the grounds charged in the deportation warrant and the finding based thereon, to wit: That Strecker himself advocated force and violence, had been omitted from the agreement that the Department of Justice signed, and which went to the Supreme Court. In this connection the Chair wants to emphasize that one of the grounds for deportation is that if the alien himself teaches or advocates or advises the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, he is mandatorily deportable independent of whether or not he belongs to the Communist Party.

There was evidence that Strecker did preach the overthrow of Government by force and violence, and there was a finding to this effect by the Department of Labor.

The Chair wishes to read into the record excerpts from the testimony of Joseph George Strecker, at Hot Springs, Ark., on October 25, 1933, before Immigration Inspector Carroll D. Paul:

Q. Are you a member of any organization or society, social, fraternal, or political?—A. I was a member of the Communist Party of America.

Q. What do you mean, "You were a member of the Communist Party of America"?—A. Well, I haven't paid my dues since February 1933.

Q. Have you notified the organization that you were withdrawing from it?—A. No.

Q. Have you had a change of heart or mind in the matter, or have you simply failed to pay your dues?—Q. Just failed to pay my dues.

Q. Then you still feel the same as you did at the time of your initiation?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you ever become a member of any organization without first acquainting yourself with its intents and purposes?—A. No.

Q. Is this your membership book in the Communist Party of the United States [presenting membership book No. 2844, issued November 15, 1932, to Joe Strecker]?—A. Yes.

Q. Were you at the time of your initiation into the Communist Party familiar with its intents and purposes?—A. Yes.

Q. How did you acquire this prior knowledge of communism?—A. From a study of the writings of Marx.

Q. How long have you studied the writings of Marx?—A. About 10 years.

Q. Are you in accord with Marx in regard to the social order of things?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you tell me what the aims and purposes of the Communist Party of America are?—A. Yes; it proposes to destroy capitalism and establish a government by the people.

Q. Do you mean a government similar to that now in existence in Russia?—A. Exactly.

Q. What means will the Communist Party of America use to attain its purpose?—A. I do not know what will be necessary.

Q. Will it resort to armed force in the event that should be necessary?—A. That is what they say.

Q. Who says that?—A. The leaders of communism.

Q. Do you mean the local leaders, the national leaders, or those in Russia?—A. All of them.

Q. Do you think that the present form of government in the United States should be destroyed and a communistic or Russian form of government established in the United States?—A. I think that the destruction of capitalism is inevitable and that the sooner it comes the better off we shall all be.

Q. Would you personally bear arms against the present United States Government?—A. Not at this time.

Q. Why not at this time?—A. Because communism is not strong enough now.

Q. Supposing that the majority of the populace of the United States were Communists, and were certain of a victory over capitalism in an armed conflict, would you then personally bear arms against the present Government?—A. Certainly; I would be a fool to get myself killed fighting for capitalism.

Q. Have you ever been in the military service of any country?—A. No.

Q. Have you done any work for the Communist Party since becoming a member?—A. All I have done was to hand out some papers.

Q. Where did you obtain these papers?—A. From the headquarters in Kansas City.

Q. What was the nature of this literature?—A. It was something calling upon the people to unite.

Q. To unite for what?—A. Against capitalism.

Q. When you speak of capitalism, do you mean the present Government of the United States?—A. It is all the same thing.

Q. Did you circulate this literature that was sent you?—A. I gave it to some other people to circulate.

Q. Will you name them?—A. I have forgotten who it was.

Q. What was your purpose in filing your petition for citizenship in the United States?—A. I thought I would have more protection if I was a citizen of the United States.

Q. Protection from what?—A. From the law.

Q. Isn't it a fact that your party leader advised you not to become too active in that you might be subject to deportation from the United States?—A. Something like that.

Q. Is that the reason you stopped paying your dues?—A. No.

Q. In the event the Communist Party of America attains sufficient power or proportion to be of service to you, will you pay up your back dues and go along with them?—A. Certainly.

Q. What is the name and address of your nearest relative in Austria?—A. My wife, Sofie Strecker. Kamionka Strum, Austria.

Q. Have you any further statement to make?—A. No.

(From statement of Strecker, before Acting District Director Walter L. Wolf, on September 16, 1933.)

Q. Is it true, as reported to that Government, that you have been distributing communistic literature?—A. A tailor from Little Rock handed some of this literature and I handed it to somebody else, but I do not know the name of the person or persons to whom I handed it.

Q. Is it not true that at one time you had a considerable quantity of communistic literature in your home?—A. I have received letters from New York urging me to buy gold bonds of the Communist Government in Russia.

Q. Have you ever bought any of these bonds?—A. Yes; I have bought 2,200 rubles worth of the Soviet Union Socialist Republic, for which I paid in American money the sum of \$15.88.

Q. When did you make this purchase?—A. About 2 months ago.

Q. It was represented to me that the United States Government's money would soon be worthless, or at best very cheap, and I thought it wise for my own protection to put my money into bonds of the present Russian Soviet Government. These bonds are paying interest in gold dollars—American money * * *.

Q. Do you now deny on your oath that you are a Communist at heart?—A. I do not consider myself a Communist, because I am not paying dues to the Communist Party. I do not know whether we shall ever have a communistic system in the United States. I have read Marx's books and Marx states that sooner or later there will be a "red" government in every country in the world. I am trying to protect myself and that is why I bought the bonds of the Russian Government. I do not know what is going to happen; I do not know how long I am going to live. If I knew when I was going to die I would get me about four women and have a hell of a time before I die. If communism comes in this country I will not be against it, because I have got to go with the people and whatever the people want I will have to go along with them.

* * * (From statement of Florence Levering (Gardner), one of the witnesses named by Strecker at his citizenship hearing.

* * * Q. Mrs. Levering, do you know what communism is?—A. I guess I do. There is plenty I don't know at all. It is a kind of organization to be to the effect to change the laws of our country.

Q. In changing the laws of our country, do you know whether the Communists propose to do so by using force or violence, or in other words, by a revolution?—A. I think they do.

Q. Did Joseph Strecker tell you at any time he was a Communist?—A. Yes; it was no secret at all.

* * * Q. It has been alleged that Joe gave you certain pamphlets or circulars pertaining to the Communist Party to distribute around the city of Hot Springs, is that true?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you distribute any of these handbills?—A. No, sir; I didn't.

Q. Did Joe ask you to distribute them?—A. Yes.

Q. What did he tell you?—A. He told me to be sure and put them bills out at night, and if I didn't want, then to get some Negro boys to do it for me. * * *

The point of this is simply that in making the agreement, the Department of Labor confined its case to the issue of membership in the Communist Party, when they had other grounds for deportation.

My attention is called to the fact that this morning in my statement I designated Mr. Mulbar as chief of the State police. That was my understanding, but I am informed he is merely a lieutenant. I am not sure what the record shows as to his official title.

We will at this time recall Mr. Knowles.

FURTHER TESTIMONY OF HARPER L. KNOWLES AND RAY D. KIMMO

The CHAIRMAN. You have a brief you wish to present on the activity of the Communist Party in their attempts to secure political control?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLES. In presenting the following brief and exhibits with respect to the political activities of the Communist International and its subordinate, the Communist Party of the U. S. A., these may be generally classified into three groups, i. e.:

(a) Activities of the Communist Party as a political entity;

- (b) Support of liberal labor organizations and their candidates, whether or not actually affiliated with the Communist Party;
- (c) Efforts of Communist groups to influence legislation and the judiciary.

(A) THE COMMUNIST PARTY

It is believed that your committee is well informed as to the national political activities of the Communist Party, but in order to introduce the various methods by which it seeks to attain its end, a brief outline of such activities is submitted.

Prior to the 1935 International Convention of the Communist Party its efforts were mainly directed to the establishment of the Communist Party of the U. S. A. as a political unity. Because, however, of the disrepute in which the party was generally held, the 1935 international convention issued instructions to its United States representatives to infiltrate into all liberal political groups and support such causes as concerned themselves with the plan of a change in our governmental structure.

Naturally, the political Communist Party had made very little progress, but when the Committee for Industrial Organization entered both the labor and political fields, Communist organizers, under instructions from the 1935 international convention, seized upon this as an opportunity to furnish their nefarious ends and render yeoman service in the promotion of the American Labor Party and Labor's Non-Partisan League. The former of these organizations has been active in the State of New York, the Farmer-Labor Party in the State of Minnesota, and Labor's Non-Partisan League in California and in other States. In Washington and Oregon the Communists openly boast of their dominance in the Commonwealth Federations of those States, both of which "liberal" political groups have gained alarming prestige and power.

It will be the purpose of this presentation insofar as the State of California is concerned to definitely establish the political activities and control of the Communist Party in Labor's Non-Partisan League and other organizations. To substantiate the fact that this is the present trend of their political activities, attention is directed to the fact that, according to official records in the office of the secretary of state of California, only 1,358 members of the Communist Party registered as such for the August 1938 primary election, whereas in the gubernatorial election of 1934 Anita Whitney, a registered Communist, when running on the Communist Party ticket for the office of State comptroller, polled a total of 100,820 votes. This is presented as evidence of the fact that the political party has "gone underground."

In the 1934 election the Communist Party makes the following statements of its subversive objectives as will be indicated in exhibit No. 1, which is submitted as evidence of Communist activities along political lines:

ONLY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BILL IS THAT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

It is no accident that the only serious project for unemployment insurance that has come before the Congress of the United States is the workers' unemployment insurance bill, H. R. 7598, which was worked out and popularized

among the masses by the Communist Party. Only the Communist Party has made a real fight for unemployment insurance, and by this fight finally forced before the Congress the first and only bill to provide real unemployment insurance.

The preceding quotation is submitted as evidence of the efforts of the Communists to promote socialistic legislation. It will be noted that the party takes credit for being the only organization to make a fight for H. R. 7598.

And in the same document and in almost the same breath they repeat their intention of establishing in the United States a "Revolutionary Workers' Government."

This crisis cannot be solved for the toiling masses until the rule of Wall Street has been broken and the rule of the working class has been established. The only way out of the crisis for the toiling masses is the revolutionary way out—the abolition of capitalist rule and capitalism, the establishment of the Socialistic society through the power of a revolutionary workers' government, a Soviet government.

In equally frank and unmistakable language there was outlined the course which would be followed by the Party once it had established its "Revolutionary Workers' Government":

WHAT A WORKERS' GOVERNMENT WOULD DO

The first acts of such a revolutionary workers' government would be to open up the warehouses and distribute among all the working people the enormous unused surplus stores of food and clothing.

It would open up the tremendous accumulation of unused buildings—now withheld for private profit—for the benefit of tens of millions who wander homeless in the streets or crouch in cellars or slums.

Such a government would immediately provide an endless flow of commodities to replace the stores thus used up by opening up all of the factories, mills, and mines, and giving every person a job at constantly increasing wages.

And a further emphasis on the Communists' objective will be found in the same exhibit (exhibit No. 1) in the following language:

The capitalist way out of the crisis lies along the way of wage cuts, speed-up, denial of unemployment insurance, fascism, and war. The revolutionary way out of the crisis begins with the fight for unemployment insurance, against wage cuts, for wage increases, for relief to the farmers—through demonstrations, strikes, general strikes, leading up to the seizure of power, to the destruction of capitalism by a revolutionary workers' government.

(B) SUPPORT OF LIBERAL LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

In the 1934 California State election, Upton Sinclair, well-known radical writer, secured the Democratic nomination for governorship on the epic "Production for Use" platform, whereas Sam Darcy was the official candidate of the Communist Party. Party instructions, however, were to the effect that Sinclair must be supported in his "Production for Use" campaign and the members of the party while rendering lip service to Darcy, worked tirelessly for the election of Sinclair who was formerly an active member of the Communist Party, but who temporarily withdrew his affiliations in order that he would not be embarrassed in his campaign for the gubernatorial seat. A short time following his defeat, Sinclair again became actively identified with the Communist Party and is today the recognized unofficial head of its activities in this State.

Peoples Daily World (official Communist paper for the Pacific coast) of the issue of July 18, 1938, is attached as exhibit No. 2 and

attention is drawn to the fact that Sinclair granted serial rights (exclusively) to that paper for his recent book, *Little Steal*.

At this time it is suggested to the committee that it call upon the witnesses, of which a list is appended hereto, for verification of Sinclair's Communist Party membership.

That will be brought up in the west coast hearings.

It may perhaps be well at this time to direct the attention of the committee to the fact that there are two indictments for perjury standing against Darcy in San Francisco, and, while a fugitive from justice, he is today the secretary of the Communist Party in the State of Minnesota, enjoying the protection of the Farmer-Labor Party Governor, Benson.

Failing in its efforts to seat any of its candidates in the 1934 State election and following the decision of the Communist International to pursue an "underground" policy, the party next interested itself in the San Francisco municipal elections of 1935, when it sponsored an organization known as the United Labor Party. Exhibit No. 3 outlines the platform of this organization, which, it will be noted, is in keeping with the various issues sponsored by the Communist Party. Further, it will be noted from the first page of this exhibit that the following Communist organizations sponsored the conference at which the platform of the United Labor Party was formed:

The Communist Party.

Public Works and Unemployed Union.

Conference for United Action Against the Criminal Syndicalism Law.

Young Communist League.

International Labor Defense.

American Youth Congress.

Exhibit No. 4 is a letter soliciting funds in behalf of the United Labor Party, and the attention of the committee is specifically directed to the fact that a majority of the names of sponsoring and affiliated organizations are those of definitely established organizations of the Communist Party.

Exhibit No. 5 is a throw-away handbill advertising an election rally of the United Labor Party to be held on October 30, 1935. It will be noted that Earl King, the chairman of the meeting, a Communist and former secretary of the local marine firemen's union, is one of those who is now serving a term in San Quentin Prison for the murder of an engineer named Alberts. William Sanders, who is next listed, has been known locally for his radical activities. Morris Benson, Tanna Alex, Lawrence Ross, Ben Legere, James Tracy, George Anderson, John D. Shaw, Redfern Mason, and Harry Bridges, who also appeared on this program, are all members of the Communist Party.

At this time we again pause to suggest that the list of witnesses appended hereto be called upon to substantiate these statements as affecting those of the above-mentioned individuals who are not self-admitted Communists.

Marked as "Exhibit No. 6" is a stenographic report of the election rally referred to in the preceding paragraph and indicates very definitely the radical trend of the meeting.

As further evidence of the Communists' support of the United Labor Party, we attach a handbill marked "Exhibit No. 7," from which we quote:

The Communist Party, which is the vanguard of the working class composed of the most courageous and militant leaders of the workers, has been the driving force to form a united front of all workers, black and white, for this United Labor Party.

As further evidence of the Communist inroads politically, and the control of the United Labor Party, exhibit No. 8 is offered, which indicates the sponsors for the various candidates running for office on that ticket. Those, opposite whose names appears a red cross, are definitely known to be members of the Communist Party, namely: William F. McGee, C. H. Nugent, John D. Shaw, Ben Legere, James Tracy, Otto G. Morgan, Morris Benson, and Tanna Alex. An interesting phase of this list of sponsors is the fact that most of these individuals sponsored the candidacy of every candidate on the United Labor Party ticket.

Next attached is exhibit No. 9, a printed handbill which sponsors the United Labor Party candidate for mayor, Redfern Mason. Attention is directed to the fact that Mason was at that time president of the Northern California Newspaper Guild, which is a C. I. O. affiliate. It is also of interest to note that the speakers listed in this handbill are the same group of Communists, including John D. Shaw, Morris Benson, Ben Legere, Tanna Alex, and, in addition thereto, Anita Whitney [1934 party candidate for State comptroller], Lawrence Ross [then county organizer for the party], and Communist Harry Bridges.

The CHAIRMAN. In what city was Mason a candidate for mayor?

Mr. KNOWLES. In San Francisco. He went from there to work for the Boston Transcript, and is now back in San Francisco as a writer on the People's World, a Communist organ.

As further evidence there is next referred to as exhibit No. 10 a handbill issued by the Communist Party advertising an election rally held at 121 Haight Street, San Francisco, Calif. [official Communist Party headquarters], at which Redfern Mason was a speaker, and at which meeting Harry Carlisle, editor of the Communist Western Worker, spoke on the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International. James Tracy also spoke in behalf of his candidacy for the office of supervisor on the Communist Party ticket.

The next exhibit attached, marked "Exhibit No. 11," is a pamphlet advertising the appearance of Earl Browder at a meeting held in San Francisco on August 12, 1936, in behalf of the candidacy of Communists, including his own, for the Presidential nomination. The attention of the committee is particularly directed to the reference in the pamphlet to the building of a Farmer-Labor Party to again bring out the direct connection between the Farmer-Labor Party and the Communist Party.

CALIFORNIA PEOPLE'S LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE

Failing in its efforts to elect the United Labor slate, the next political move of the Communist Party was to again place a partial party slate in the 1936 State election in California, as indicated by the attached printed copy of minutes of a meeting held by the

California People's Legislative Conference in the city of Sacramento on January 16, 1937, marked "Exhibit No. 12." Without attempting an item-for-item comparison of the objectives of this new group, as compared with the platform of the Communist Party, the report on the bills which were endorsed at this conference was almost identical with the expressed policy of the party. Again will be found, among the list of delegates to the congress, a large number of known members of the party.

HONEST GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

The next move on the part of the Communist Party was to sponsor in the city of San Francisco in 1937, a so-called "Honest Government Committee." The attached card, marked "Exhibit No. 13," gives the pictures of four supervisal candidates, of whom two, George Anderson and Herbert Nugent, are known members of the Communist Party. Their efforts in this election, however, met with little success.

Again, to prove the same Communist control of the various political moves, there is attached and marked "Exhibit No. 14," copy of Peoples Lobby News, published by the California People's Legislative Conference, under date of August 21, 1937, in which it takes credit for launching the "Honest Government Committee" and in the list of sponsors will again be found several Communists and other radicals, among these being Russell Powell, Dr. Thomas Addis, R. E. Shippey, Rev. Dillon W. Throckmorton, Henry Schmidt, Rev. Hebrick Lane, and Carmela Zitex.

LABOR'S NONPARTISAN LEAGUE

The Peoples Legislative Conference decided to change its name to that of Labor's Nonpartisan League, as evidenced by attached exhibit marked "Exhibit No. 15." The attention of the committee is directed to the fact that this letterhead lists John L. Lewis as being chairman of the board of Labor's Nonpartisan League; E. L. Oliver, executive vice president, and Sidney Hillman as treasurer.

The next exhibit attached, marked "Exhibit No. 16," is a statement of the aims and purposes of the Labor's Nonpartisan League. It is a matter of more than passing interest that the majority of those listed as officials of the organization are also members of the Communist Party, as previously indicated herein.

On the eve of a meeting of the league held in Santa Maria, Calif., on June 20, 1937, Senator Culbert Olson, Democratic candidate for Governor in the California State 1938 election, met with the strategy committee of the Communist Party and was assured that the party would carry out the program of the Labor's Nonpartisan League and that this C. I. O. organization would proceed with plans which would culminate in Olson's election to the governorship. Olson received the nomination.

While it is not generally believed that the Labor's Nonpartisan League is under the complete control of the Communist Party throughout the United States, we now ask the committee to call witnesses, of which a list has been appended hereto, for the purpose of establishing actual Communist control of the league in California.

CALIFORNIA FEDERATION FOR POLITICAL UNITY

This organization came into being on April 25, 1938, and was comprised of many liberals and radicals who had not been taken into the Labor League fold. The reason for the establishment of another organization was that under this new name it was believed that the professional and white-collar classes could more successfully be drawn into a political interest along liberal and radical lines. The Committee for Political Unity is comprised of both Communist and Trotsky elements, but in the main it is simply a counterpart of Labor's Nonpartisan League.

Again to establish the Communist support of both the league and the committee, there is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit No. 17," copy of the Communist People's Daily World, of August 20, 1938, in which the endorsements of these two organizations for the primary elections were quoted, but not those of other political parties. The attention of the committee is particularly called to the fact that in only one instance is there a conflict of recommendations, that is, in the office of superintendent of public instruction. In the same exhibit it will be noted that considerable publicity is given to the policies of the Political Unity Committee.

It may well be asked why both of these organizations did not make recommendations for the office of governor. This was all merely a part of Communist strategy, as the party did not deem it advisable to have the Labor League occasion any embarrassment to State Senator Olson in his campaign for the Democratic nomination. However, since the primary election which was held in California on August 30 the Peoples Daily World has come out openly in advocating the candidacy of Senator Olson.

The amazing part of the 1938 political campaign is the appointment of John G. Clark as chairman of the campaign committee for the Democratic Party. It is amazing because John G. Clark, at least until the time of his appointment, was a member of the Communist Party in the State of California.

The State of California has therefore today as candidates for three of the highest offices in its gift and a campaign manager the following:

Culbert Olson, for Governor, who fraternizes with and accepts the program of the strategy committee of the Communist Party.

Ellis Patterson, for lieutenant governor, a member of the Communist Party.

Sheridan Downey, for United States Senator, was a running mate of Communist Upton Sinclair in 1934.

John G. Clark, chairman of the Democratic campaign committee and a member of the Communist Party.

To further establish evidence of the communistic affiliations of the candidates listed above, a brief summary is submitted in each case.

CULBERT L. OLSON

According to Western Worker of November 18, 1935 (then official Communist paper), Olson sent a letter of protest to Superior Judge Harris, of San Francisco County, in connection with the trial of Communist Louise Todd, who had been charged with perjury and was convicted on this charge. Olson, in making this protest, was attempt-

ing to interfere with the administration of justice, and at the same time was a sworn officer of the State of California.

Again, on December 2, 1935, Western Worker records the fact that at a meeting of the American League Against War and Fascism held at San Jose, Calif., on November 24 of that year, greetings from Senator Olson were read. The A. L. A. W. and F. is a Communist organization now known as the American League for Peace and Democracy.

In its issue of March 5, 1936, Western Worker again recorded the activities of Senator Olson by stating that he would be one of the eight delegates at large on the Upton Sinclair slate in the May Presidential primaries.

Pacific Weekly, a Communist publication formerly produced at Carmel, Calif., reported on October 26 that Olson was one of the sponsors of a meeting on October 18 of the Progressive National Committee which was held at Fresno, Calif. Out of this grew the "Labor's Non-Partisan League."

According to issue of Legislative Conference News previously introduced as exhibit No. 12, Culbert Olson was present at a people's legislative congress held at Sacramento, Calif., on January 17, 1937.

In addition to the statement heretofore made that Olson met in private session with the strategy committee of the Communist Party on the eve of the people's legislative conference which was held at Santa Maria, Calif., on June 20, 1937, he was also a speaker on the program and voted favorably on all resolutions introduced by the radical element.

Olson was also a delegate to the State convention of Labor's Non-Partisan League held in San Francisco, December 11 and 12.

The San Francisco Chronicle of January 12, 1938, reported the formation of the Western Consumers Union, listing Olson as one of the sponsors. Among others connected with this Communist organization are listed also the following radicals:

Dr. Thomas Addis, a member of the Communist Party, who was arrested during the World War for violation of the Neutrality Act, although later pardoned by President Wilson, and who was later denied citizenship on the grounds that he was not attached to the principles of the United States Government.

James San Jule, also a party member, who was formerly at the head of the Producers Cooperative Association—sponsored by local radicals, and who is now actively identified with the Simon J. Lubin Society, which organization is dealt with in the agricultural section of this report.

Aubrey Grossman, a San Francisco attorney, admitted to the bar over the strong protest of the American Legion, who objected to his admission because of his known radicalism while a student at the University of California. Grossman is now connected with the law firm of Gladstein, Grossman, and Margolis, which firm handles a large majority of labor cases of the radical variety. Grossman is a known Communist.

H. P. Melkinow is at the head of the Pacific Coast Labor Bureau, an organization which has largely represented radical labor unions in wage negotiations. He is generally regarded as the personal adviser of Harry Bridges.

The Peoples World, successor to the Western Worker, in an issue of April 30, 1938, reported that Senator Olson would be the principal speaker at a mass meeting to be held in Los Angeles on May 4 under the auspices of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

On June 10 Olson appeared as a speaker at a so-called mass rally held in San Francisco under the auspices of the Anti-Nazi League, a Communist organization.

Olson is also one of the sponsors of the radical Simon J. Lubin Society which will be dealt with in the agricultural section of this report.

Again we find the Communist paper, Peoples World, giving publicity to Olson's activities. In its issue of July 29, 1938, this paper stated that Olson was to address a reception held in Los Angeles on that date for Max Bedacht, national secretary of the International Workers' Order, which is the recognized insurance branch of the Communist Party. Bedacht is also a member of the national central committee of the U. S. A. section of the Communist Party.

ELLIS E. PATTERSON

Western Worker of January 28, 1935, reported Patterson as having endorsed the proposed repeal of the California criminal syndicalism bill.

The March 11, 1937, issue of Western Worker, states that Patterson spoke at a people's legislative conference held in Oakland, Calif., on February 26 and in the issue of May 10 of that year, the same paper states that he addressed a meeting of the Simon J. Lubin group at Oreville, Calif.

Again the Western Worker in its issue of May 20, 1937, reported that Patterson would speak at Sacramento, Calif., in behalf of Mooney and Billings.

The San Francisco Examiner of July 26, 1937, reported that Patterson had been chosen by the Commonwealth Federation—which was then proposed as a radical political unit in California but which has not yet materialized in California—and by the Progressive Party as candidate for Lieutenant Governor of California.

On July 25 of that year Patterson was a speaker at a Communist mass meeting held in the San Francisco Civic Auditorium in behalf of Mooney and Billings.

Patterson is one of the State sponsors of the Friends of Abraham Lincoln Brigade, an organization sponsored and controlled by the Communist Party for the purpose of enlisting moral and financial support from the people of America for the Communist cause in Spain and for many hundreds of Americans who have, through their efforts, enlisted in that cause in violation of our neutrality laws.

He was one of the sponsors of the California Committee of One Hundred, out of which grew the Committee for Political Unity.

Western Worker, which was then the official Communist paper, and which was published semiweekly, announced that it would be published daily commencing January 1, 1938, and that its name would be changed to Peoples Daily World, Patterson wrote a letter

which was published in the December 9 issue of that paper welcoming the new *Peoples World*, which read as follows:

AL RICHMOND,

Editor, the Western Worker,

DEAR MR. RICHMOND: We need a newspaper in California that will tell the people the unbiased truth about all social, economic, and political events that are happening here and abroad. We need men in the newspaper business that are big enough to print the news as it happens.

We need men to print newspapers who are free from the influence of their advertisers, free from the influence of any pressure group that seeks to warp the true facts of events as they happen.

We need a newspaper that will voice the cause of the masses, the cause of democracy—political and economic.

Give us a newspaper in the State that will champion liberty, progress, and peace.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIS E. PATTERSON.

Patterson was one of the delegates to the State convention of the Labor's Non-Partisan League held in San Francisco, December 11 and 12, 1937. The *San Francisco Chronicle*, of January 3, 1938, lists Ellis Patterson as being one of the sponsors of the Consumers' Union, which organization has previously been dealt with in connection with the activities of Senator Culbert Olson.

The *Peoples World* of May 6, 1938, lists him as one of the guests at a mass anti-Nazi conference. This was sponsored by the Communist Party, held in Los Angeles on May 4.

The June 28, 1938, issue of the *Peoples World* stated that Patterson would act as chairman at a meeting to be held in Los Angeles on June 29 under the auspices of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Patterson was also the sponsor of the Simon J. Lubin Society, which organization was described in connection with the report submitted on Senator Olson.

Submitted hereto as further evidence of the radical affiliations (exhibit No. 18) of Olson, Patterson, and Downey is a booklet published by the Tom Mooney Molders Defense Committee, on the front cover of which appears Mooney's picture and on the fourth page Olson's picture. Further in the booklet appear the photographs of Ellis Patterson and Sheridan Downey, as well as those of State Senator William Mosely Jones and Assemblyman Paul A. Richie. The latter two are equally as well known for their radical activities as are the first three.

The attention of the committee is respectfully directed to the following quotation from a letter from Tom Mooney under the date of August 1, 1938, which appears in this booklet, addressed "Dear Friends," and which has been marked for ready reference:

In 1934 Culbert L. Olson was elected State senator from Los Angeles by a substantial margin against stiff opposition. He is highly regarded by the entire labor movement of California because he had the best labor record of any State senator at the last two regular sessions and the special session of the legislature, and in fact of any legislator who has ever sat in the State senate. He is a champion of civil liberty and defender of democratic institutions. He is the best-known candidate throughout the State, and is justly popular among the farmers, small merchants and business people, and professional groups. He is the one liberal candidate favored by labor, who will pardon me, and who can be elected.

And with respect to Ellis Patterson, Mooney, in the same letter, has this to say:

I want also to say a few words in behalf of several candidates for other offices. Ellis E. Patterson is running for lieutenant governor. He is the outstanding liberal candidate in the field, with a long record of unselfish service to the people of California. He is waging a vigorous campaign, and it is my fervent wish to see him elected. His record on labor and civil liberties during the three terms he has served in the assembly places him at the very top of the list, and he has been one of the most active and devoted men in public life seeking to obtain justice for us.

If by any chance the responsibility should ever rest with Ellis Patterson to consider my case as Governor of California, I know he would pardon me. I sincerely hope that he will be elected to this high office.

Concerning Sheridan Downey, Mooney makes this appeal:

Sheridan Downey deserves the support of all liberal and labor and forward-looking people in his campaign for United States Senator. He is the only candidate for the Senate who has declared himself on the *Mooney case*. In his first broadcast after launching his campaign Sheridan Downey eloquently and courageously declared himself for the preservation and protection of civil liberties, and pleaded for justice in the *Mooney case*. He said, "Here in California we have the world-known case of Tom Mooney. I have been a trial lawyer throughout my adult life, and I have studied the *Mooney case* at some length. I am certain that he was indicted because he was a labor leader, and convicted on perjured and corrupt evidence. I hope we will elect a governor who will right a great personal and political wrong by the pardon of Tom Mooney."

The purpose of bringing to the attention of the committee the radical affiliations of the candidates who received the nominations for the three highest offices of the State of California, is to indicate and prove the tremendous inroads which the Communist Party has made into our body politic.

All three of these candidates, Olson, Patterson, and Downey, have gone on record to the effect that if they were in a position to do so, they would pardon Mooney, and the latter predicates his appeal to the electorate for support of those candidates on this basis.

It is an unfortunate commentary upon our political body when we have three men seeking high offices who publicly announce that they will set at naught the decisions of our highest tribunals. If it were not a serious matter, it would be amusing to consider the grounds upon which Mooney requests support of these candidates. Mooney, of course, is a Communist, and his fellow members who are now enjoying the liberty which they are seeking to destroy have been highly successful through their indefatigable efforts to enlist mass support in behalf of a criminal convicted of a mass murder. While it is true that Mooney has never confessed this crime, the Communists are almost equally as active and partially successful in enlisting support for the freedom of J. B. McNamara, whom they eulogize as the "oldest labor prisoner." McNamara confessed that he blew up the Times Building in Los Angeles several years ago, in which some 20 lives were lost, and the basis for the Communists' appeal in his case is that he did not know there were so many people in the building. This ridiculous excuse, however, does not preclude the efforts of the Communist Party to secure the release of McNamara.

As a further indication of the degree to which the Communists and Liberals have been effective in obtaining the support of our legislators, attached hereto as "Exhibit 19" are photostatic copies of five letters written by California assemblymen in October and November 1935 to

Governor Eugene Talmadge, of Georgia, each of which urges the exercise of gubernatorial powers in the case of Angelo Herndon, a nationally known Negro Communist who was convicted of insurrection in the State of Georgia. This is all a part of a concerted drive to enlist sympathy and clemency for convicted criminals with whose innocence or guilt the writers of such letters cannot in all probability have knowledge. It is a Communist device for raising a public din and clamor in the cases of all "labor" prisoners without regard to their guilt or innocence to the end that mass pressure may be invoked and orderly processes of law be rendered ineffective.

(C) EFFORTS OF COMMUNIST GROUPS TO INFLUENCE LEGISLATION AND THE JUDICIARY

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

This organization has unquestionably been one of the most active in not only attempting to influence legislation but also in defense of Communists and other radicals who run afoul of the law. In his testimony before the Fish Commission, with which your committee is undoubtedly familiar, Roger N. Baldwin, director of the A. C. L. U., admitted the revolutionary nature of its program and upheld the right of assassination.

In the annual report of the American Civil Liberties Union for 1937-38, a copy of which is herewith submitted as "Exhibit No. 20," there is published a program of the A. C. L. U., under the heading "Program Ahead," which will be found on pages 66 and 67. We are reproducing below the 13 paragraphs of this platform and are making comments thereon following each section to indicate the effect upon our Constitution and upon our civilization if this organization were permitted to carry out its program.

1. Opposition of all forms of gag legislation curtailing freedom of speech, press, or assemblage; and particularly bills making criminal mere language, or restricting the right of minority parties to the ballot.

Successful opposition to legislation of the type described would not establish liberty but would create license, and prevent enactment of nonprohibitive regulatory measures designed for the common welfare. It would permit unrestricted public abuse and would aid and abet the assemblage without control of each and every subversive group in the United States.

2. Campaign against the array of laws and regulations restricting freedom in education, both in schools and colleges, and particularly against the compulsory oaths of loyalty for teachers, compulsory flag saluting by children, and compulsory military training.

If this campaign were successful, it would entirely dispense with all regulations concerning the selection of school books and subjects, and would completely throw down the bars and permit the introduction into our schools and colleges, which are already too highly impregnated with socialistic and communistic documents and teachings, of theses and doctrines of which the sole objective is the revolutionary overthrow of the United States Government. It would remove all control from school and college trustees and officials, eliminate loyalty oaths and saluting the flag, which at present serve as a healthy

reminder of allegiance for both our citizens and students to the country of their nativity or adoption.

The elimination of compulsory military training is something for which the A. C. L. U. has worked ceaselessly, ignoring the fact there are private colleges where this is not required; ignoring the benefits of healthy discipline resulting from this training, and further ignoring the fact that there is no law which compels the attendance of a student at a school or college where military training or any other objectionable feature is in existence.

The question of our own national defense also enters into the situation, and is further evidence of the plan of the Communist Party, the A. C. L. U., and other affiliated organizations, to tear down, if possible, the whole structure of our national defense.

3. Changes in the immigration and deportation laws to end all restrictions merely because of political opinions; to admit and protect genuine political refugees; and in citizenship proceedings to remove tests of aliens' views not imposed on citizens.

The adoption of such a clause through suggested changes in our immigration laws would open wide our gates to hordes of undesirables from all countries and would require us to protect murderers and assassins. Citizenship would be granted to an alien and the benefits of such citizenship bestowed upon him whether or not he believed in our established institutions, and whether or not he entered this country for the sole purpose of bringing about its downfall.

4. Aid in campaigns for the release of political prisoners, and against all prosecutions under sedition and criminal syndicalism laws.

The carrying out of this program would release many convicted thugs and murderers from our prisons and penitentiaries and permit them to again prey upon the public. Prosecution for sabotage, sedition, and other subversive acts would be entirely eliminated and the people of the United States and the country itself would be at the mercy of these unlawful elements.

5. Campaigns to open up all areas or cities where the rights to meet and organize are denied, and particularly to gain recognition for free speech by setting aside recognized public places for meetings.

This is merely an effort to bring about legislation to permit the Communist Party and its affiliates to have the free use of our public schools, city auditoriums, etc. They have not been denied the right to meet and organize and in many instances they have gained encouragement in being permitted the use of our public buildings for their subversive gatherings. Certainly patriotic citizens and taxpayers have the right to say to what use the public buildings erected with their moneys shall be put.

6. Continuous defense of labor's rights to organize, strike, and picket and to bargain collectively without interference; opposition to martial law, suspending civil law, in strikes. Prosecution of vigilantes or other lawless elements attacking strikers' or nonstrikers' rights.

The rights of labor to organize, strike, picket, and to bargain collectively are guaranteed under our present laws. What the A. C. L. U., however, desires, is to make martial law illegal, the effect of which would be in the event of labor difficulties which approach riots such as have occurred in this country in the past 2 years to render our State and local authorities powerless. Property rights would be set

at naught and the general public subjected to the viciousness of mass hysteria and violence.

7. Defense of the right of the unemployed to organize, demonstrate and petition without interference or penalties; maintaining the right of relief workers to organize and protest without penalty.

The right of the unemployed to organize has not been questioned, but rather has been confirmed. The A. C. L. U., however, desires the right to demonstrate and petition without interference or penalties. Certainly there can be no objection to the unemployed submitting a petition, but demonstrations often get out of hand, as has been so frequently evidenced throughout the United States of late.

8. Campaign for State labor injunction laws modeled on the Federal law and those adopted by 16 States.

The purpose of this plank in the platform is to deprive all employers of any recourse to law, regardless of the actions of labor.

CENSORSHIP

9. Greater freedom of the air by radio by setting aside time for public discussion free of station managers' control by requiring equal facilities for all sides of controversial topics; and by opposing governmental censorship in any form.

The purpose of this action is readily apparent, and that is to secure for the Communist Party and its allies, free time on privately owned radio stations, at the same time removing the present censorship. Again it is license which is being sought by the A. C. L. U. instead of liberty.

10. Change in the bureaucratic Post Office censorship by requiring trial by jury for excluded matter, as now in effect in the Customs Service concerning matter imported from abroad.

It is apparent that the intention of this clause is to remove all Post Office restrictions so that there might be a free flow of photographic pictures, letters and books throughout the mails. All other matter is being freely transported.

11. Abolition of the motion-picture censorship boards in six States, leaving sole control of movies to public opinion, and, in extreme cases, criminal prosecution; opposition on the same basis to censorship of books and plays.

The removal of censorship of motion pictures, which up to the present time have been kept fairly wholesome, would soon have the producers catering to the perverted minds in our country through suggestive, lewd, and licentious pictures. This would further be carried out by the removal of censorship on books and plays.

RACIAL MINORITIES

12. Aid in the campaign against lynching; and in the struggle for Negroes' civil rights.

There can be no argument against a campaign against lynching, nor can there be any question about Negroes' civil rights, but behind the innocence of this clause lies the desire of the Communist Party to build up a tremendous Negro membership on the basis that the party and its affiliates have supported the Negro in his campaign for civil rights. Not only do they desire civil rights but this is intended also to convey the idea of social rights.

13. Extension of civil rights in colonies under American control, with autonomy or ultimate independence, if so desired.

The effect of this proposal would be to dispense with all protectorates of the United States, which would undoubtedly affect our vulnerability in the unfortunate event of war with some other country. Here again is evidence of the intention of the Communist Party to render this country powerless.

In the same exhibit the A. C. L. U. devotes pages 47 and 48 to a delineation of the rights of the Communists and boasts:

In sharp contrast to preceding years no protests against Communists for political activities took place in 1937-38, continuing the tendency reported for the year previous.

On page 89 of the same exhibit is listed the board of directors, the majority of whom are so well known nationally for their Communist activities that any comment thereon would be superfluous.

The American Civil Liberties Union has concerned itself actively in the case of every alien arrested for deportation and has attempted to interfere with the due processes of our laws. It does not make any difference whether the arrestee is in this country illegally and has dedicated himself to the overthrow of our Government; the A. C. L. U. is invariably active in his defense.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR DEFENSE

Inasmuch as it is believed that your committee is fully informed as to the activities of this national organization and because of the fact that these activities vary in different localities only in minor degrees, no attempt will be made to submit detailed comments on this subversive activity, which, it is believed, would simply result in duplication and confusion.

OTHER "DEFENSE" ORGANIZATIONS

In the State of California there is a law existing on our statutes establishing penalties for seditious acts and utterances, and so forth. The Communist Party, through an organization known as the Conference for United Action Against the Criminal Syndicalism Act, as well as through other organizations affiliated with the Communist Party, has made a consistent and determined effort to bring about the repeal of this law.

The attention of the committee is here directed to exhibit No. 21, which is a list of criminal syndicalism convictions from the effective date of the law to the present time, involving 139 cases. While the Communist Party and other radical organizations have been able to enlist the support of recognized unions, in an effort to secure the repeal of this measure, it should be noted that in not one of the convictions has a member of a legitimate labor union been sentenced under this law. The Communist strategy, however, is to infiltrate into the unions and proselyte, on the ground that if this measure remains a law, it will ultimately be used as a weapon against unionism. The record, however, speaks for itself.

Further evidence, indicating a definite alliance between the Communist Party and the movement to repeal this law, is shown in additional exhibits which are now being presented.

Attached is exhibit No. 22, a handbill advertising a parade and mass rally held on May 1, 1935, international "red" holiday, at which rally Sam Darcy, then district organizer of the Communist Party, and heretofore referred to in this section of the report, was one of the speakers, and William Moseley Jones, Democratic assemblyman, was another.

Attention is again directed to exhibit No. 18, heretofore referred to, which is a pamphlet issued by the Tom Mooney Moulders' Defense Committee, wherein a photograph of Assemblyman William Moseley Jones welcoming Mooney to the rostrum of the State assembly on March 10, 1938, is reproduced. Jones is the Democratic nominee for attorney general from the State of California, and his candidacy is enthusiastically endorsed by Mooney.

Exhibit No. 23 is submitted as covering the uncensored texts of radio talks delivered during March 1935, in the fight for the repeal of the criminal syndicalism law. Attention is here directed to the fact that the three speakers who presented arguments over the radio were:

Ben Legere, former candidate of the United Labor Party for the office of sheriff of the city and county of San Francisco, heretofore referred to in this section of the report.

Anita Whitney, Communist candidate for State comptroller in the 1934 election.

Henry Schmidt, now president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 1-10, who is a close associate of Harry Bridges, and who is an active member of the Communist Party.

The next exhibit, No. 24, is a handbill advertising a meeting for the repeal of this law, which was held at Eagles Hall in San Francisco on December 21, 1935. It will be noted that Ben Legere, Harry Bridges, William Sanders, William F. McGee, and Leo Gallagher, all of whom have previously been referred to, were speakers at this meeting. In addition, we find A. L. Wirin, counsel for American Civil Liberties Union, who later received an appointment at attorney for the National Labor Relations Board. Subsequently, however, Wirin returned to his position as southern California counsel for the A. C. L. U.

Also billed as a speaker is Albert Hougardy, one of the criminal syndicalism defendants, a known Communist with a police record.

It will be noted that this meeting was conducted under the joint auspices of the Conference for Labor's Civil Rights, E. P. I. C. League of San Francisco, the Democratic Open Forum, and the A. F. L. Trade Union Committee for Unemployment Insurance, all Communist organizations.

As indicative of the efforts of this organization to bring mass pressure to bear there is next, exhibit No. 25, a form of postal card addressed to the California Board of Prison Terms and Paroles, demanding the immediate and unconditional release of Louise Todd, a Communist, who had been convicted by a jury of perjury in connection with the false certification of election petitions.

Handbill advertising mass meeting to be held on February 5, 1935, under the same auspices, is submitted as exhibit No. 26, and the committee is directed to the fact that among the principal speakers were

the following individuals concerning whom references have previously been made in this section of the report:

Anita Whitney, Communist Party.

George Woolf, president, ship-scalers' union—also member of the Communist Party.

Ben Legere, San Francisco counsel, Democratic Party.

William Sanders, ornamental iron workers' union.

Herbert Nugent, secretary of the Conference for Repeal.

In addition to the foregoing, Pat Lydon of the Contra Costa Central Labor Council, a Communist, who later became organizer for the C. I. O., and Kaspar Bauer, a Communist, were also speakers.

There is submitted a report on a State conference of this group which was held at Sacramento, Calif., April 19, 1936, marked "Exhibit No. 27," and again the attention of the committee is directed to the appearance of many of the same names on the list of speakers addressing this conference.

Exhibit No. 28 advertises a mass meeting of June 2, 1937, to be held in San Francisco. In addition to Assemblyman Patterson (now candidate for lieutenant governor), Leo Gallagher, former Communist candidate for attorney general, two of the criminal syndicalism defendants are also on the program as speakers.

To further tie in the Conference for Repeal of Criminal Syndicalism Act and other radical organizations with the Communist Party attention is now directed to exhibit No. 29, handbill advertising a meeting which was held on October 27, 1937, in San Francisco. By this time the committee must be sufficiently familiar with the names of those who have been active in this movement as to avoid the necessity of repetition, but we do find Ellis E. Patterson, candidate for lieutenant governor, listed as one of the speakers, and Henry Schmidt, a Communist heretofore referred to, as chairman of the meeting.

At the foot of this handbill, under the caption of "Our Future Work," appears the following:

Free all other labor prisoners—Tom Mooney, Billings, McNamara, the Modesto boys, King-Ramsey-Conner, etc.

OTHER "DEFENSE" ORGANIZATIONS

On every occasion where a Communist, anarchist, or other agitator has been arrested in connection either with a major or minor offense against the laws of our land there has been brought into being through the efforts of the Communist Party, the American Civil Liberties Union, International Labor Defense, et al., a "defense committee." For example, there have been the following local organizations: Mooney Defense Committee, King-Ramsey-Conner Defense Committee, the Angelo Herndon Defense Committee, the Scottsboro Defense Committee, the Ship Scalers' Defense Committee, the Modesto Defense Committee, and many others.

As an indication to the committee of the utter disregard in which these groups hold our established institutions of justice and the freedom with which they abuse our courts and district attorneys of perversion of justice, and so forth, the following exhibits are offered: Nos. 30, 31, and 32, issued by the King-Ramsey-Conner Defense Committee.

Exhibit No. 33 is a handbill issued by the Ship Scalpers' Defense Committee. Here, again, the attention of the committee is directed to the names of the speakers, which must by this time be familiar to the committee. Typical of the Communist strategy, this handbill urges "Protest against this monster frame-up."

Exhibits Nos. 34 and 35 are a post card and a handbill demanding freedom of Modesto frame-up victims. The news item in the latter exhibit was written by Peter Quince, who was then a writer for the Communist paper, the Western Worker.

It will be noted that George Kidwell, a former member of the I. W. W.; Ella Winters, a known Communist and a writer on Russian activities; Harry Conover, a teacher of the University of California, who subsequently lost his position because of his radical activities; and Harry Bridges were among the speakers at this meeting.

Before closing this section of the report, it is desired to call to the attention of the committee a few instances of efforts to exert mass pressure on our judiciary.

James Workman, a Communist who successfully agitated labor difficulties in the mining town of Jackson, Calif., was arrested in February 1935 on a charge of carrying concealed weapons. Workman has a long police record—grand larceny, petty larceny, robbery, first-degree burglary, disorderly conduct, and vagrancy. On the concealed weapon charge he was sentenced to 1 year in the county jail with an allowance for 4 months already served. Judge Maxey, of Stanislaus County, Calif., who presided at the trial, received many threatening letters and telegrams, one of which is quoted below:

We denounce conviction of James Workman as a deliberate frame-up to intimidate striking Jackson miners and destroy the union. We demand that you grant Workman a new trial.

(Telegram from Herbert Nugent, secretary of California Conference for the Repeal of the Criminal Syndicalism Law, dated October 6, 1935.)

Nugent, it will be recalled, was an active member of the Communist Party.

In the cases of the so-called Modesto defendants who had been convicted on a charge of illegal possession of dynamite in connection with an alleged plot to blow up a Standard Oil service station and a boarding house at which employees of that company resided, and who were convicted in Stanislaus County, the superior judge of that court received a telegram signed by F. J. McConnell and Ida Roth (real name Rothstein) reading as follows:

We demand the immediate and unconditional release of these workers.

McConnell is a member of the Communist Party and of practically everyone of its affiliates. He recently had the temerity to apply for citizenship, but his request was denied on the ground that he was not attached to the principles of the United States Government.

Ida Rothstein has been a member of the Communist Party for many years.

There have been innumerable other instances where Communists have flooded the courtrooms, deluged the court officials and prosecuting attorneys with abusive protests, staged mass parades, and so forth, to thwart the ends of justice. The foregoing instances are merely scattering indications of party tactics.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose we take a short recess before we hear this other witness.

(Thereupon a brief recess was taken.)

The CHAIRMAN. Will you call the witness?

Mr. NIMMO. Mr. Hannon.

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH F. HANNON

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Your name is Joseph F. Hannon, is it not?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You live in San Francisco, Calif.?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you lived there?

Mr. HANNON. Eighteen years.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed with your statement.

Mr. HANNON. I am offering this statement to the committee of the House of Representatives investigating un-American propaganda voluntarily and for the good of the community, State, and, Nation.

I am a member of the American Legion of the Department of California and am a member of the antsubversive committee of the Legion and likewise a former member of the Americanism committee of the San Francisco County Council of the American Legion. I have been a member of the citizenship committee of the San Francisco County Council of the Legion, conferring with Mr. Armstrong of the Naturalization Bureau regarding matters of immigration, naturalization, and citizenship.

I was also a member of the national Democratic campaign committee for the California Veterans' Division in 1936. I was a member of the administrative staff, in charge of employment, Works Progress Administration, Seventh District, San Francisco County, and in that I occupied the position of a director's assistant, also in charge of the Veterans' W. P. A. employment.

I am also a member of the Communist Party and am chairman of the finance committee of the San Francisco County Federation of Political Unity, an affiliate of the Communist Party. I am also a member of the Simon J. Lubin Society. I am a member and elected trustee of the C. I. O. Affiliate Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, and am delegate for the same to the Labor's Non-Partisan League Council and State convention of the C. I. O., California, 1938. I am also a member of the Workers' Alliance of America.

In 1934, Upton Sinclair was the candidate for Governor of the Democratic Party in California. In connection with his candidacy at that time was what was known as the EPIC plan, and in connection with his development of this plan and of his candidacy in California that year he was associated with one R. J. Wakefield, the said R. J. Wakefield being the campaign manager for Upton Sinclair. Afterwards the said Wakefield was W. P. A. employment director, District seven, State of California, and I was Wakefield's assistant and was in charge of veterans' employment.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you go any further, don't you think it would be well to clarify the reason you joined the Communist Party and these organizations? It was to get information, was it not?

Mr. HANNON. It was to get information, because I could see the infiltration into the churches, into the labor organizations, and into the Republican and Democratic Parties—both parties, because there have been infiltrations made in both cases.

The CHAIRMAN. So that, as a member of the Americanization committee, you joined these organizations for the purpose of finding out what was going on?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; continue your statement.

Mr. HANNON. In 1935, at a time when I had no connection with the Communist Party or with the Federation of Political Unity, it came to my attention that the Communists were penetrating the major political parties of California, both Republican and Democratic. When this came to my attention I was greatly disturbed and immediately felt that it was my patriotic duty to investigate and to take such measures or attempt to take such measures as would assist in undoing this destructive work which came to my attention.

If the committee desires me to amplify or particularize the destructive work of which I now speak, I shall be very glad to answer all questions put to me.

In November 1935, the EPIC candidate, Upton Sinclair, having been defeated in 1934, attended a meeting in the office of Culbert L. Olson in Los Angeles, Calif. At that meeting there were present Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Olson, Mr. Wakefield, myself, and others. The purpose of the conference was to discuss the organization of a new Democratic group, and it was decided to take the name "Progressives." This, in my judgment, was the beginning of a strong "left wing" movement in the Democratic Party. The group of so-called Progressives which grew out of this original meeting I have come to know as affiliates and members of Communist Party organizations who follow the Communist Party's lines laid down by the Communist Internationale in Moscow.

Since 1934 these Progressives have been engaged in the process which is popularly known among them as "boring in" and, in fact, it was in this group that I first heard that phrase used. These Progressives sat in conference with Mr. Sinclair and catered to him and carried out his wishes. Wakefield was sent by these so-called Progressives to enlist the support of the Federation for Political Unity of California and all the radical C. I. O. unions, including the International Longshoremen's Association. Since that time such men as Borace Boris, who is now the president of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, San Francisco local, and is national vice chairman of the Committee on Industrial Organization in charge of the Pacific coast, Paul Pinsky, who is also a high official of the same group, his wife, Bernard Offenheim, head of the Young Communist Group and organizer for the Young Communists, his wife, Walter Matlin, editorial writer for the People's World (Communist) of San Francisco, Herbert Nugent, and Richard Warfield, became powerful in this group, some of whom are not even citizens of the United States, but, nevertheless, control certain Communist affiliations and assist in dictating the policies of their respective particular fields.

The men whom I have just mentioned are powerful figures in the Communist group and are in frequent consultation with Harry Bridges, and it is also to be noted that they take their instructions from Harry Bridges and that the work which they do and which is directed by Bridges is distinctly along Communist Party lines.

I have from time to time had conversations with the parties whom I have mentioned above, and I particularly recall conversations with Richard Warfield, with Paul Pinsky, and Bernard Offenheim. Richard Warfield told me, at a time when I was a candidate for the Communist Party, that he was a member of the Communist Party but that he never told anybody that he was, and he said to me, "When you are a member of the Communist Party you will not tell anybody that you are a member because we bore from within." The same statement was made to me by Isaac Folkoff, a prominent member of the Communist Party. Pinsky, Warfield, and Offenheim also have told me on different occasions that Harry Bridges is a member of the Communist Party. Pinsky has said "that Bridges would deny it and would always, as I would be supposed to deny it when I was a member of the party."

What I am trying to do is to emphasize that these prominent members of the Communist Party who were subsequent affiliates, supporters, and workers with this group of Progressives heretofore described, including Senator Culbert L. Olson, the present candidate for the Governor of the State of California; Ellis B. Patterson, present candidate for Lieutenant Governor of the State of California; Richard Flamert, defeated candidate for assemblyman in the twenty-second assembly district of California, have active contact with Harry Bridges and have brought together the said Bridges and these candidates. These parties are working to secure the support for the Democratic candidate for Governor and Lieutenant Governor of not only the Communist Party but of Harry Bridges, who is recognized as one of the most powerful persons in the State of California.

Because of my acquaintance with the persons that I have heretofore described and growing out of my contact with the said Wakefield, I have been in frequent contact with many of the most powerful Communists in the San Francisco Bay region. This situation has brought it about that I have been present upon occasions when Bridges was present. Upon one occasion, during the month of June 1938, at the home of Paul Pinsky, at 1795 Pacific Avenue, San Francisco, I was present with the following persons: Germaine Bulcke, now president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 1-10, San Francisco; Harry Bridges, Paul Pinsky, Borace Boris, and Bernard Offenheim when the following statement was made by Harry Bridges:

I am well protected in San Francisco and I have a connection in Washington, so there is no fear of me being deported.

The foregoing statement by Bridges was induced by a jocular remark made by Pinsky to the effect that he, Bridges, might not be here in September 1938, apparently referring to the possibility of deportation.

On the following day, at the University of California Medical School, Parnassus and Third Avenue, San Francisco, both Pinsky and myself being at that time employed at that place, Pinsky said to

me in the presence of Offenheim and Warfield, "Why, before Harry Bridges would be deported, every C. I. O. union in the United States would go on strike and there would be a revolution. He'll never be deported."

Richard Flambert, a member of unit No. 102 of the professional section of the Communist Party and State president of cooperatives, closely affiliated with the Consumers' Union, is supervisor in charge of street survey, a W. P. A. project in San Francisco city hall. He is the contact between the Communist Party and W. P. A. and looks after the procuring of jobs for Communists. Flambert is powerful enough in the Works Progress Administration activities in San Francisco to put any Communist to work within 12 hours after losing his previous assignment.

Beginning about August 1, 1938, and continuing to October 21, 1938, I was editing on the youth survey project of the Works Progress Administration in San Francisco. This project gives a peculiarly strong opportunity to the Communist group to inoculate the youths who are investigated in connection with the work of the project. The Communist Party seized this opportunity to recruit members for the Young Communist League, and I have been informed by prominent Communists that through this means 79 of the youths who were investigated have been enlisted in the Communist Party.

Isaac Folkoff, Shifra Monsky, and Hal Sawyer conceived the idea of having a political meeting at which for the first time in California Olson, the Democratic candidate for Governor; Patterson, the Democratic candidate for Lieutenant Governor, and Downey, the Democratic candidate for United States Senator, would be brought together on the same political platform.

On the same platform it was their intention, also, to have Richard Flambert, who was at that time a candidate for assemblyman. At this particular meeting, at 714 Market Street, San Francisco, the Communist Party, in combination with the Federation of Political Unity, devised ways and means to raise the money to support the platform upon which these various candidates appeared. A check was forwarded to the Veterans' War Memorial Commission, signed by Harry Hosmer, and was returned by the War Memorial Commission. One week after this these candidates appeared under the Federation of Political Unity banner in the Scottish Rite Auditorium in San Francisco. This meeting was under the Federation of Political Unity auspices and the hall was paid for with their money which resulted from the solicitation of their Communist comrades.

The graduates of the Young Communist League are required to assist these candidates in every way possible by making collections at political meetings, as they did on the night of the gathering at which Olson, Patterson, and Downey appeared. The sum of money derived from the activities of these young people is said to be very considerable and is raised in this way to be devoted to the election of Olson, Patterson, and Downey.

At the aforesaid meeting at 1795 Pacific Avenue, where I contacted Harry Bridges, a Chinese cook, a member of the American Legion, questioned me as to why I was at a "red" meeting and I told him I would talk to him at a later date. Paul Pinsky questioned him afterwards, and I was told, 48 hours after this incident, that I would have

to be investigated by the Communist Party before I was taken into the party. A short time afterwards, in July 1938, Isaac Folkoff, Shifra Monsky, and Richard Warfield informed me that on account of my background with Culbert Olson and R. J. Wakefield I had been given clearance for admission into the Communist Party.

In May 1938 the California Federation for Political Unity, a Communist affiliate, wanted to hold a convention in southern California. They made application for the use of the public schools—

The CHAIRMAN. What public schools were those; in what town?

Mr. HANNON. Of Los Angeles.

The CHAIRMAN. The public schools at Los Angeles?

Mr. HANNON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. HANNON. But in this they were frustrated by the fact that the school board refused to permit the members of the Communist Party to use the schools. I was informed by William J. Plunkett, a Communist, secretary of the Federation for Political Unity, that Senator Olson declared to the school board that inasmuch as the Communist Party was a registered party in the State of California, it was entitled to the use of the public schools.

My contact with the various Communists whom I have mentioned, and with many others, afforded me information which, though coming to me fragmentarily, nevertheless convinces me that the Communist Party is gradually acquiring a viselike grip on all political and social activities throughout the State of California; that the party is making a comprehensive effort to infiltrate into all such organizations by introducing into these organizations their own members so that these members may carry out the party dictate of boring from within; that the Communist Party is united behind the candidacy of Culbert L. Olson, Democratic candidate for Governor of California; Ellis Patterson, Democratic candidate for Lieutenant Governor of California; and Sheridan Downey, Democratic candidate for United States Senator, and that these gentlemen have sought the votes of the Communists but at the same time are seeking to hold the vote of the conservative Democrats of my State; that Harry Bridges is a Communist and that he is one of the most powerful persons in the State of California, and that it is a recognized circumstance that people must go to him to seek influence necessary for many purposes, such as those that are connected with political effort and labor unionism.

It is also my information that the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians was organized on the west coast by Borace Boris and Paul Pinsky, and that it is distinctly a Communist organization which has established nuclei of Communist members in the various navy yards on the Pacific coast, in airplane factories, and various industries necessary in the national defense. I have acquired this information in my capacity as chairman of the engineers' organizing committee of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians.

I am now willing to answer any questions which your committee may desire to put to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Hannon, did the Communist Party in California endorse these candidates for public office?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have those candidates ever repudiated the Communist endorsement?

Mr. HANNON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are the Communists taking an active part in their election campaigns?

Mr. HANNON. Very much so.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you presented with a membership card when you joined the Communist Party?

Mr. HANNON. No, sir; the members of the Communist Party have to go to school. They have an 8 weeks' school, and I was designated as a political organizer. Until I have finished my schooling, which so far has only gone for 2 weeks, I will not get my card as a political organizer. However, I have evidence of the fact that I am a member of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. What evidence do you have? You do not have any hope of getting your membership card now, do you? You have shown me here a membership book, bearing a Workers Alliance No. 229237, State Office, 320 Market Street, Workers Alliance of America, issued to Joseph F. Hannon. Is this organization a Communist organization?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Why do you say that?

Mr. HANNON. Because the Workers Alliance of San Francisco is headed by Herbert Nugent, who now heads this organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know it to be a fact that well-known Communists are directing that organization?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are many Communists members of the organization?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have here also your membership card in the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, signed by the national secretary-treasurer. You say that is also a Communist organization?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir. Paul Pinsky and Borace Boris organized that on the west coast, and they are both well-known Communist members.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that organization dominated and controlled by the Communists?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. By those you mentioned and others?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I have here a letter dated September 17, 1938, from the San Francisco Communist Party, new members' section, 121 Haight Street, which says:

SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNIST PARTY,

NEW MEMBERS' SECTION,

September 17, 1938.

DEAR FRIEND: It is with real pleasure that we received your application to join the party of the working people. The fact that you signed this application shows that you agree with its principles and its program, and the necessity for all of us working together to achieve our common aim.

I do not know just how much you know about the party, the way in which it works, its theory, and the people who comprise it; but I feel sure that you would like to learn more about this before you decide just which phase of the work you are most fitted for. To prepare our new comrades for this work

we have organized a system of new members units in which, for a period of 8 weeks, our new comrades study our basic theory, take part in some of the actual work carried on by the party, and get to know some of the other new people who have joined our ranks.

We are starting a branch for new members on September 22, 1938, at 8 p. m., at 121 Haight. If it is possible, will you please come that evening.

Comradely yours,

ELVIA NORRELL,

Membership Director, New Members' Section.

Was that letter addressed to you, and did you receive it in the course of your mail?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. While you were in the Workers Alliance and in this other organization, and during the time you were getting ready to graduate into full membership in the Communist Party, did you have occasion to attend meetings?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you came into contact with all the Communists in that area?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You came to know them, and to know what their program was?

Mr. HANNON. Yes; I came to know them personally, inasmuch as there are various branches. When you first go into the Communist Party you are not allowed to know all the members in that vicinity. You are put into certain branches or units.

It so happened that I was employed at the University of California Medical School with Paul Pinsky, who was a leading Communist and who had introduced me to several Communists before I went into this class. In that way I came to know Richard Flambert and Richard Wakefield, and other powerful Communists in San Francisco.

The people I met in the unit were people who were just gradually coming into the party, but Flambert, Olso, and Warfield had recommended my candidacy into the party, and other members of the party O. K'd it, so that is how I became a candidate.

The CHAIRMAN. I was interested to hear the information that a few years ago the Communist candidate received over 100,000 votes in California. Can you tell the committee what you learned with reference to the size of the Communist Party membership in the State of California?

Mr. HANNON. In making a statement to Pinsky and Warfield as to how many have been admitted into the party, and how many registered, and also when I got a supplementary statement from them—

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by "registered."

Mr. HANNON. Registered as members of the voting Communist Party, and the figure I got from them at city hall was that it was in the vicinity of 1,300 or 1,400, but he said, "we have a working membership in San Francisco of approximately 40,000." And R. J. Wakefield told me that they had a working membership in the State of California, 3 weeks ago, of 145,000.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the total voting strength of the State?

Mr. HANNON. About 3,500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he tell you as to whether or not the Communist Party of California had made any growth in the past few years?

Mr. HANNON. Yes; and I know from the statement signed by Armeta Whitney, produced and circularized, that it has greatly increased in membership in the last 6 months.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they give any reason for that?

Mr. HANNON. Political activity among Communists that have infiltrated into, or that had gone into various civic and social organizations in San Francisco and the surrounding Bay territory.

The CHAIRMAN. Their diligence in getting into other organizations has put them in contact with many new people and afforded them an opportunity to get new people?

Mr. HANNON. Yes; inasmuch as a Communist will enter an organization, and within two or three meetings, by pre-arrangement with the executive committee members, like Harry Bridges in the unions, Paul Pinsky and Warfield in the Consumers Union, those Communists immediately become executive officers of these social and other organizations which they enter, such as civic organizations, which may not be communistic, but they will control them from the outside.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they conduct workers' schools and train members in the technique and strategy of the party so they can permeate other organizations and seize the control of important positions?

Mr. HANNON. That is what the 8 weeks' schooling consists of, or about 50 percent of it.

The CHAIRMAN. You attended some of those meetings?

Mr. HANNON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. They give you instruction in Marxism?

Mr. HANNON. Instruction in Marxism, instruction in social and economic problems, and how to appeal to the average person, so you could get their sympathy for the cause.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they teach them how they can better working conditions, or rather, is it their purpose in infiltrating into a labor organization to improve working conditions or to create class hatred and stir up strife?

Mr. HANNON. To stir up strife principally. Their modus operandi is this: They will plant one or two members in a certain union, who are well-known Communists, in an organization such as the Mare Island or Vallejo Navy Yard or the Bremerton Navy Yard or the Douglas Air Plant, and then they will have those Communist members of their unions circularize petitions to improve conditions in those places, and when they have enough petitions then they will bring pressure on the organization to have them improve the unwarranted conditions, and in that way they will maintain that they have a contract, or are about to get a contract with the powers that be, even in the navy yards, and how they could get action in these various navy yards, as they said, by bringing pressure on the commandant.

The CHAIRMAN. You, of course, asked them as many questions as you could in order to get as much information as you could.

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you say they are not only attempting to influence the Democratic Party but the Republican Party as well?

Mr. HANNON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. They have no particular choice?

Mr. HANNON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Whatever party happens to afford the best opportunity at a given time, they seek to permeate that party; is not that true?

Mr. HANNON. That is exactly true.

The CHAIRMAN. They have no candidate of their own in California at election time?

Mr. HANNON. Yes; they have Leo Calvert and Armeta Whitney.

The CHAIRMAN. Those candidates are mere figureheads?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And word is passed around to vote for the candidates you have named?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that shown by the fact that their vote 2 years ago was over 100,000, whereas in the last election it dropped to 2,000?

Mr. HANNON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Showing that the others went into the Democratic or Republican primary and cast their votes.

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. One of their most effective strategies is to cry "Red-baiting!"; is not that true?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. By that method they hope to intimidate sensitive people into abandoning any real fight against them and their program.

Mr. HANNON. Yes; and they use the term "red-baiting" in enhancing the fact that there may be sensitive people who will stop bothering them, and these sensitive people will know——

The CHAIRMAN. What are you doing at the present time; what is your position?

Mr. HANNON. I am editor of the Youth Survey, a national——

The CHAIRMAN. How do they make any inroads among the middle-class people?

Mr. HANNON. Just by giving social gatherings among the civic groups in and around the bay district. That is the system at San Francisco at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you explain that? Do they succeed in converting middle-class people to any extent, or do they get the great majority of their converts from the poorer population?

Mr. HANNON. They have had such success among the poorer and less educated classes that now they are attempting, as in the case of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists and Technicians, Dental Technicians, Hospital Internes, Graduate Doctors—they are attempting to get them under their banner.

The CHAIRMAN. But the majority of those people do not know anything about the Communist influence or control?

Mr. HANNON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. What they do is to organize some organization with a high-sounding title, with some lofty purpose, either for peace or democracy, or with some other high-sounding title that appeals to the middle class we are talking about.

Mr. HANNON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And they get into such organizations while the middle-class people who are in there know nothing about the fact that the Communists are controlling the organization.

Mr. HANNON. That is true, and that is what they call party strategy which is taught in the 8 weeks' school.

The CHAIRMAN. And they have undertaken to permeate the veterans' organizations, as well?

Mr. HANNON. Yes; they have appealed to some of the veterans, veterans without jobs at the present time, and they are working on their various campaigns, and that is why the families are being supported by that money.

The CHAIRMAN. They divide up their work into committees, or units, and they assign one member to one particular field of activity; they may work among the trade unions, or they will assign other members to work among the schools.

Mr. HANNON. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. So they have their work well organized along the same plans that have been enunciated by the Soviet leaders in Russia.

Mr. HANNON. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. They get all that instruction from Russia?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir; for instance—

The CHAIRMAN. From your contact with them, and your conversations with them, are you in a position to tell this committee whether or not they still believe in achieving their objectives through revolutionary methods?

Mr. HANNON. They still believe in achieving their objectives through revolutionary methods, but they have softened up to this idea, recently, since the first of January of this year, and put it into effect now, and the subterfuge or strategy of boring from within is the mode of operation at the present time, rather than force.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, they soft-pedal the revolutionary phase of their program in order to just build up a large membership?

Mr. HANNON. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. Was not that strategy adopted partly to prevent deportations?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the reason they adopted the so-called Trojan horse policy.

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But in the workers' schools and in their meetings, they still preach and advance the overthrow of government eventually by force and violence: is not that the fact; is not that right?

Mr. HANNON. That is right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the very basis of their whole program, when you get into it, is it not?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the strategies you mentioned was this red baiting cry; in other words, to try, by ridicule and belittlement, through their sympathizers, as well as the members, to minimize the seriousness of their program; is not that a fact?

Mr. HANNON. That is it exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. Their policy is to keep the country apathetic and indifferent?

Mr. HANNON. And uninformed.

The CHAIRMAN. And uninformed, until such time as they have a large enough membership trained, and in strategic positions, to really do effective work; is not that a fact?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In addition to their program for the working class, they have a program for the intelligentsia, do they not?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. A program that is disguised under the name of liberalism. They use that name very frequently now, do they not?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the purpose of that is to appeal to those people of progressive minds or visionary views?

Mr. HANNON. They bring in people from every major party—both Republicans, Democrats, and Progressives—with the idea of liberalism with things that the American tradition has not heard of before.

The CHAIRMAN. They have no success with members of the Socialist Party, have they?

Mr. HANNON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is because the Socialists are fully informed as to their strategy and their activity.

Mr. HANNON. Yes; and their machinations.

The CHAIRMAN. The chief difference between Socialists and Communists is that the Socialists preach communism to be achieved by lawful and peaceful means; that is the big line of demarcation between socialism and communism, is it not?

Mr. HANNON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. In addition to that the Communist insists upon international communism as distinguished from national communism.

Mr. HANNON. Exactly. In other words, the American Communist Party is still governed from Moscow.

The CHAIRMAN. They make no denial of that, do they, in their literature and their pamphlets?

Mr. HANNON. In the new applications of the Communist Party it is called the American Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Twentieth century democracy! But actually, as a matter of fact, they receive their orders from the Comintern.

Mr. HANNON. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. They are part of the Third International, governed by the Comintern, which in turn is governed by Stalin.

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Their orders come from Russia, and they are put into effect by the various units of the Communist Party.

Mr. HANNON. Yes; they come from Russia once a week and are delivered out of New York to various units throughout the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The American Legion in California has been waging a very earnest and sincere fight to combat this, has it not?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. This has been a patriotic movement on the part of the Legionnaires?

Mr. HANNON. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. To do everything in their power to find out what the facts are, and to be in a position to give the facts to the American people.

Mr. HANNON. Exactly; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Communists send, or get as many of their leading workers to go to Russia as often as possible; do they not?

Mr. HANNON. That is for the purpose of getting information from the high executive committee and for further schooling in a graduate course

The CHAIRMAN. After they have graduated from the elementary Communist schools here, the higher education is in Moscow?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the reason why some of the leaders go over there and spend a period of time?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And in addition to their program of infiltration into various other movements, to seize control of strategic positions, they also hope to build up a strong bloc in the United States sympathetic with Russia; is not that a fact?

Mr. HANNON. That is very true.

The CHAIRMAN. And they feel that should war break out between Russia and, we will say, Germany on the one hand, they feel that if Russia could have the sympathy and support of the United States, it would be of tremendous value; is not that a fact?

Mr. HANNON. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. And if they could not involve the United States in a war, if they could secure financial assistance from the United States, and supplies and materials, that would enable Russia to fight much more effectively; is not that a fact?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So that while the long-range program is eventually to establish communism in the United States, the short-range program is to build up and have as many people as possible in this country, both those actually party members and those who sympathize with the Communists, and they lean as much upon those who have the same general trend toward government, government control, and government ownership, and so on, and they cultivate those people as well as their own party members, do they not?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir; they do.

To bring out that point about government from Russia, at the time of the war scare a short time ago, Stalin issued a statement that was circulated throughout the United States, throughout all the units, and through the party, to this effect, that if Russia was caught in war they would ask some of these union Communist members to defend it. That was published in California.

The CHAIRMAN. One proof of that is the fact that they are always agitating against what they call an imperialistic war.

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But there is never any agitation against a war if we were going to ally ourselves with Russia. That would be the procedure in case of war, on the part of the United States, that the United States should assist Russia in the war, but in case the United States did not assist Russia, or if the United States, as a matter of fact, assisted some other country, then their party members and sympathizers in the United States should do everything they could to bring about sabotage and destruction and violence; is not that a fact?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So that the short-range program is to build up these blocs and organizations in every democratic country to aid Russia, both financially, by contributions from the members and, if possible, to get them into war.

Mr. HANNON. That is the ultimate, with Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the American Legion in California found it difficult to arouse the people as to the seriousness of the threat?

Mr. HANNON. Because the cry has been "red-baiting," sneering and belittling such efforts, that is the policy of the party, to deny that, and to create such a feeling among the populace, not only in California but in other States, as I have noticed.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you regard communism as a definite threat to that section of the country; has it become a major factor there?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir; it has.

The CHAIRMAN. Not so much through party membership, that is the total party membership itself, as it has through the infiltration of Communists into other organizations; is not that right?

Mr. HANNON. Yes; and the influence they have had in the economic situation, inasmuch as some of the Communist members, Richard Flambert, by name, can place on the Government pay roll two or three hundred people, half of whom will be alien Communists, while American citizens, veterans, will be unable to get work.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell me this: Among the organizations that they have organized, there is, let us say, an anti-Nazi league of some kind. There are numerous organizations of that kind. So they will organize some sort of an anti-Nazi league, which has a good title. Most people here are opposed to nazi-ism, so they get people to join that organization. Most of the people who join do not take any active part in the organization, but the trained Communists manage, without any difficulty, to seize control of the strategic positions. That is a fact; is it not?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Has not that been done in California?

Mr. HANNON. Several times; I can mention times and places.

The CHAIRMAN. When these anti-Nazi leagues, or anti some or other kind of league, are formed, for a good purpose and a good intention, the great majority of the members never attend after the first meeting?

Mr. HANNON. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. So that the trained minority of Communists do the work and look for the opportunity to take control, and they get in and begin to run the organization; is not that the fact?

Mr. HANNON. That is the fact.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you not know of a specific instance in California where that was done, where an anti-Nazi league was formed, composed of many loyal patriotic Americans, but very few of them attended meetings thereafter, and certain well-known Communists got in and took advantage of the picture?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir; I know of a specific incident of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is in keeping with well-known strategy and policy?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Sometimes the most effective way of dealing with the situation is to expose it so that the people may see it. If, for instance, a great many loyal patriotic Americans belong to organizations, the key positions of which are held by well-known Communists—and the record is full of such cases of people whose communistic affiliation is not questioned—if those people are advised of the fact that the organization is being used by Communists to pro-

mote their ends and aims, then they will be in a position to withdraw and have nothing to do with it.

Mr. HANNON. Exactly; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know that in the membership card of the Communist Party we find a fund for the International Solidarity; that that fund is sent to the Communist Parties in other countries as well as in Russia?

Mr. HANNON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So that they have an admirable vehicle all over the world of raising money which can be sent to Russia in time of emergency; is not that a fact?

Mr. HANNON. Or any other country where they need it, where the Communist Party needs it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hannon, the committee wants to express its appreciation to you, as a patriotic citizen, for giving us the benefit of your information and knowledge. Of course, it is impossible to find out what is going on unless some patriotic citizen undertakes to get within the organization and adopts the same tactics that the Communists use so successfully; is not that a fact?

Mr. HANNON. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, when they infiltrate American organizations for the purpose of influencing them and stirring up strife, you do not hear such a hue and cry, but if an American citizen enters a Communist organization he is immediately branded a labor spy by some people; is not that a fact?

Mr. HANNON. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. I have here a telegram from Homer Martin, who was scheduled to appear before this committee tomorrow. It reads:

May I respectfully request to be excused from testifying before your committee at this time? I am now in the midst of delicate negotiations which are extremely important to the continued peaceful relations between labor and capital in the motor industry. In the winter of 1937 labor in the motor industry was confronted with an intolerable situation due to industrial espionage and other equally reprehensible and illegal methods used to prevent collective bargaining and self-organization. The attitude of the industry toward labor happily has changed materially since then, due in no small measure to the tactability and fine Americanism of our President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and our Governor, Frank Murphy. Much of the progress toward industrial peace would be gravely imperiled if I now came and reopened old wounds before your committee, which has unwittingly become embroiled in partisan political controversy by men who have not the truly American will for peace in our industrial democracy.

Respectfully yours,

HOMER MARTIN,

GRISWOLD BUILDING.

President, United Automobile Workers of America.

I have several speeches that Homer Martin delivered and it may be, if Mr. Martin will affirm the statements in those speeches, we can incorporate them in the record and have all the information that the committee might want to have. But that is a matter we will take up at a later date.

Mr. Martin was under subpoena to appear here early last week. The Chair excused him on the ground that he was ill. Then he got a postponement for another week, the Chair still seeking to accommodate him. He was under subpoena to appear last week. I do not know just what interpretation may be placed on this, and I will make no further statement at this time.

I might say that the most effective way that any of this testimony can be answered is not by newspaper blasts or attempts to ridicule,

or some ex-parte statement, but to come before this committee and under oath tell us what the truth is. That is all we want. Full latitude will be accorded and every courtesy and fair consideration. All that they need to do is to come here and under oath say to this committee what are the facts. If these charges are incorrect, if any of them are baseless, if they are biased, if they are colored, then this committee wants to know that fact. No one is in a better position to give us the full facts than the labor leaders.

We ran into the situation of certain people in Detroit being accused of membership in the Communist Party. The ones who sent the telegrams to us, gave out the telegrams to the newspapers in Detroit before they reached the office. Not one of them has volunteered, has offered to come and testify under oath. And that is what is going to count in the final analysis, not some ex-parte statement or some personal abuse. It is their willingness to come here and expose themselves to the penalties of perjury in the event that a falsehood is told.

But with reference to this particular case, we will take that under further consideration.

Mr. KNOWLES. Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to thank you for the courtesy you have extended me while I have been in Washington. I hope that I have been of service to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee appreciates very much the patriotic attitude of the American Legion in seeking to help this committee get the facts. We know that the purpose of your organization is to preserve Americanism; that you are opposed to all alien isms; that it is the prime purpose of your organization to ferret out these un-American activities. And it is a very laudable work and one in which all true Americans should be engaged. Despite any ridicule or personal abuse that may be heaped upon you, the chairman of the committee expresses to you in the name of so many loyal Americans, the great majority of whom are patriotic, appreciation of the fine work you have done in your area.

Mr. KNOWLES. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. We are going to send a subcommittee out there so that these numerous witnesses will have an opportunity to testify with reference to the facts. We expect to do that in the very near future. We are going to continue this investigation without intermission, as fast as we can, as fast as we can get witnesses here, in the hope that we can give the American people some picture of what the true situation is.

Of course, we do not vouch for the accuracy of all testimony that is given here. We do not say we are going to predicate findings upon all of that testimony. But we want to say that we are going to afford the American people an opportunity to be heard, and we want those on the other side likewise to be heard, so that in the end, when we come to make findings, we can make findings upon facts and not upon any conclusions or opinions.

Mr. NIMMO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join Mr. Knowles in expressing appreciation of your exceeding courtesy to the American Legion and to us, who have attempted to represent it here. Thank you very much, indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. We will adjourn at this time subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon the committee adjourned.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1938

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. Is Mr. Homer Martin present?

(Mr. Martin did not come forward.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will send Mr. Martin the following letter:

OCTOBER 27, 1938.

MR. HOMER MARTIN,
Detroit, Mich.:

While I appreciate the terrific pressure that you have been subjected to to prevent your appearance before our committee I deeply regret that as a warm friend and defender of Governor Murphy you do not see fit to appear before our committee. I have several speeches which you delivered together with numerous statements made by you to the press and I had hoped to have you verify these statements under oath so that they might form a part of our record. According to these statements Communists have gained a definite foothold in union activities in your area and have been responsible for a large part of the lawlessness and violence which have shocked every good citizen who believes that law and order are the basis of our democracy.

For instance in your speech of July 28, 1938, over the radio at the Shrine of the Little Flower, you stated: "I am not red baiting when I say that the Communist Party has put forth every possible effort that they could put forth to capture the entire labor movement in this country. I am not raising a red scare about it. I am telling you what I know from experience to be the facts. The capture of the United Automobile Workers of America was the first goal and the most important goal of the Communist Party. I have letters in my office sent out by the Communist Party to our membership, the names and addresses of which they had gotten by manipulating themselves into office, telling them that very thing. In order to further their plans and their hopes of gaining control they have worked in various ways. One, of course, is to get the local Communist leaders elected to positions of influence—presidents of unions. The Dodge local by the deal was to be turned over to the Communist Party and in exchange for this very serviceable service, Richard T. Frankenstein was to be given the political backing of the Communist Party.

That change in attitude came immediately after a conference in Atlantic City at the C. I. O. conference, where for the first time I knew that Frankenstein had met Gebert and Hathaway, of the Communist Party. For days he was with them there. In Flint, Mich., Wyndimer Mortimer, who in 1935, according to the affidavits we have, invited three of our members to join the Communist Party at one time. I mean it is not just merely hearsay—I am not trying to give you hearsay—but we have those that will produce that in the record. Wyndimer Mortimer in charge of ————— that placed every secretary without a

single exception. Why, when I went into Flint headquarters I thought I was in the headquarters of the Communist Party. Every organizer on the staff and every secretary, without a single exception, that Mortimer had appointed was a Communist Party member. Mr. Gebert informed me that if I would just come down to Mr. Weinstone's office or meet him, Mr. Forester, Browder, and others, and deal with them on the number of organizers to be appointed. There are at least four deals in which Dick Frankenstein was mixed up with the Communist Party. In the Hamtramck election a deal was made in Dick Frankenstein's office in the Griswold Building with Mortimer, Hall, Gebert, and Weinstone by which Frankenstein was to use the labor movement to elect certain Communist Party leaders to the council. The above excerpts are from your speech of July 28.

On August 17, 1938, you also made a radio speech in which you said:

"In the U. A. W. A. local unions officers by one false statement or one false position after another have allowed Communists to be elected to local offices by one maneuver or another. They were not exposed and often able to take control in local unions. The entire list of local unions have been turned over to the Communist Party and then the Communist Party has mailed its propaganda to the members of those local unions. As I said here before in Washington, D. C., Moserick, of the Conference for the Protection of Civil Rights, boasted that they had taken \$67,000 out of the auto union locals here for the Communist Party, that is, in the city of Detroit. And I say it without fear of contradiction, headquarters of the labor leaders are afraid to say anything about the Communists and their activities. They have not the moral, or the intestinal fortitude to stand up and say what are the facts. I can point to our own set-up in Michigan, where the power and light strike took place. Organizers appointed there were men from Fisher Body No. 1. They were appointed as representatives of the C. I. O. by John Brophy. Both of them were known and recognized in Flint.

They were not effective in our union because they were recognized as Communists. And among all the organizers in Flint, Brophy chose the Communists to put them on the pay roll of the C. I. O. The whole set-up in Wisconsin is communistic, and our unions won't join. It is not an accident that John Brophy went to the west coast and appointed Harry Bridges. Bridges can deny that he is a Communist from now to Doomsday and I will not believe him. This is characteristic of them all down the line. We know from first-hand information in our own unions, in the U. A. W. A., that he will not work with our officers who are elected by the members but will go around in a circuitous manner and work with the Communists in the local unions. Brophy has surrounded John L. Lewis with Communists. I told John Lewis that in his own office. I know that Lee Pressman is a stooge for the Communist Party. I know that John Brophy is, and I know that the editor of the C. I. O. News in Washington, D. C., Lon de.Ceux, is a Communist. I know that. Just recently in an executive board meeting of the Non-Partisan League they named two Communists to run, one for the State senator and the other for State representative. John Zaromba is one of them, and Stanley Novack is the other.

Both of these men are known Communist Party members and yet they are expecting the U. A. W. A. will supply money to elect them to the State legislature. I have talked to John Brophy; he immediately said, "I can't be a Communist. I am a Catholic. I say to you that, in my opinion, the Communists would study for the priesthood in order to put over their propaganda."

If these quotations are not correct, please advise me. You say we have permitted partisanship to enter into the investigation. This question is much bigger than partisanship. It involves the future of the Republic. While I think you have made a mistake in failing to appear before the committee and giving us the facts fearlessly regardless of politics; I shall not insist upon your doing so at this time.

Now, I have a letter from Robert Jackson which I have not had time to answer, but will do so this afternoon; also telegrams from two members of this committee, Mr. Arthur Healey and Mr. Jack Dempsey, which will also be answered and given to the press later today, as soon as we have an opportunity here.

Our witness this morning will be Mr. Creighton.

TESTIMONY OF J. H. CREIGHTON

(The witness was duly sworn.)

The CHAIRMAN. Your name is J. H. Creighton?

Mr. CREIGHTON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Creighton, where do you live?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Lansing, Mich.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you lived in Lansing, Mich.?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Since 1926.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is your business in Lansing, Mich.?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Newspaper reporter.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a newspaper reporter; is that what you said?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. For what newspaper?

Mr. CREIGHTON. The State Journal, in Lansing.

Mr. CREIGHTON. The State Journal in Lansing.

Mr. CREIGHTON. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you held that position?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Since 1926.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your area or beat, whatever you call it?

Mr. CREIGHTON. I cover the State Capitol and the Governor's office.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been doing that ever since when?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Since 1927 I have been on that beat.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by covering the State Capitol? You interview the Governor, and attend everyone of his press conferences?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you interview him on different occasions?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you cover the members of the legislature?

Mr. CREIGHTON. During the sessions of the legislature there are two men on the beat from each newspaper. I cover one of the houses of the legislature.

The CHAIRMAN. You received a wire yesterday from me, as chairman of the committee, advising you to appear here and stating that if you did not come voluntarily, the committee would issue a subpoena, but that we hoped that you would come voluntarily, and the subpoena would be delivered on you when you got here?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And that your expenses would be paid, together with the usual \$5 a day; and you came in response to that telegram?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you recall the occasion of the so-called Lansing holiday?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Give us the date of that, if you can.

Mr. CREIGHTON. Monday, June 7, 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you covering the capitol on that day?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You were following out your assignment as a reporter for this newspaper?

Mr. CREIGHTON. That is right; that is the beat.

The CHAIRMAN. What time of day did you first go to the capitol?

Mr. CREIGHTON. About 8:30 in the morning.

The CHAIRMAN. About 8:30 in the morning?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there at 8:30 any demonstration taking place on the streets?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you see when you arrived on the scene, in and immediately adjacent to the capitol?

Mr. CREIGHTON. I could see that Capitol Avenue, which runs in front of the capitol, was blocked from curb to curb with automobiles which were deserted. I could see that Michigan Avenue, which ran at right angles to it, was likewise jammed; and all of the downtown area that I could see from the capitol portico was completely jammed with automobiles.

The CHAIRMAN. The capitol was completely barricaded in all directions by automobiles?

Mr. CREIGHTON. No; that is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the fact?

Mr. CREIGHTON. The automobile entrance to the capital, which is in the back, or the west end, was available to anybody who wanted to come. All of the blocked streets were immediately in front of the capitol.

The CHAIRMAN. They were blocked?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. But the particular avenue you are speaking about is one used by members of the legislature and the official family?

Mr. CREIGHTON. No. There is only one way to get to the capitol by automobile and that is in the west or back entrance. You could get in that way and get out, but you had either to enter or leave by streets that were designated by those who were patrolling them there. You could not under any circumstance get in or near the downtown area. You had to come in by a circuitous route.

The CHAIRMAN. You are now speaking about the area immediately in front of the capitol?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the situation with reference to the downtown section; was it likewise barricaded by automobiles—that is, the streets?

Mr. CREIGHTON. You could not have gotten a wheelbarrow through there.

The CHAIRMAN. You could not have gotten a wheelbarrow through there?

Mr. CREIGHTON. No. At one point, on Washington Avenue, one of the two main streets, there was a body truck that extended virtually from curb to curb. You could not get anything through anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. There was not any way, then, to come into the downtown section of the city?

Mr. CREIGHTON. The men who were patrolling the corners turned the people back; they would not let you in. Even if there had not been any automobiles, you could not have gotten in.

The CHAIRMAN. Who were patrolling the corners, the streets, and all?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Well, except for the overseas identification, in many instances, of the U. A. W. A. trench hats that they wear, they were largely men in factory clothes and working clothes.

The CHAIRMAN. And did they have what are known as flying squads?

Mr. CREIGHTON. They did.

The CHAIRMAN. Or squadrons, whatever they call them?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of such squadrons, approximately, did they have, could you tell us?

Mr. CREIGHTON. It is hard to say. There were on several occasions flying squadrons formed or designated. Whether in some cases they were the same persons, or part of previous squads, I do not know. I do not recall that there were more than two or three perhaps at any one time detached from the main body.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, from time to time a squadron would be formed and sent on an errand?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Did these flying squads have clubs with them?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You saw clubs?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Many of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say most of them were armed with clubs?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes; I would. Certainly it is true of the men who were guarding the intersections of the streets.

The CHAIRMAN. What were the duties of the flying squads, what were they assigned to do?

Mr. CREIGHTON. In specific instances, they were directed through loud speakers that had been set up.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were the loud speakers set up?

Mr. CREIGHTON. On the steps of the capitol.

The CHAIRMAN. On the steps of the capitol?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was directing the whole operation?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Lester Washburn.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is Lester Washburn?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Right now he is regional director of the U. A. W. in Michigan. He has been promoted since that day. On that day he was a local steward in one of the plants.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there more than one loud speaker set up?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Well, there was one system. I do not know how many speakers there were. There was one microphone.

The CHAIRMAN. How many people were there? Of course, it is difficult to estimate the number in a crowd, but give us a rough estimate of the number of people who were immediately in front of the capitol.

Mr. CREIGHTON. Three to four thousand, I would say.

The CHAIRMAN. How many people were in the downtown area?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Oh, perhaps six. I would say that would be a reasonable estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. How many people were around the jail?

Mr. CREIGHTON. The majority of the balance. In other words, perhaps two thousand.

The CHAIRMAN. Around the jail?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was the jail with reference to the downtown section and with reference to the capitol?

Mr. CREIGHTON. It is almost directly across the street; in other words, just across the capitol lawn. It is within a stone's throw of the front of the capitol.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the occasion for this demonstration?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Earlier in the same morning—that is to say, sometime after midnight of that same day—some seven or eight persons for whom warrants had been issued for violation of a court order enjoining picketing of a local plant had been arrested. The sheriff had been unable, due to lack of deputies and due to the number of pickets at the plant, to carry out the order during the daytime. These persons were arrested during the night and put in jail.

The CHAIRMAN. About how many of those persons were put in jail?

Mr. CREIGHTON. I believe there were six or seven. I do not recall, exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. Was Mr. Washburn one of those?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Mr. Washburn was not; no.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there a warrant out for him?

Mr. CREIGHTON. There was.

The CHAIRMAN. But they had not succeeded in apprehending him?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Correct.

The CHAIRMAN. These men were charged with refusing to permit nonstrikers to enter plants?

Mr. CREIGHTON. That is the exact charge.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether or not they had used force to prevent the nonstrikers from entering the plants?

Mr. CREIGHTON. It is a debatable question.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know, then?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes; I know what the nature of the charge was.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the nature of the charge?

Mr. CREIGHTON. That they prohibited by duress and intimidation, these men from entering the plant. No one was charged with hitting anybody or exercising physical violence.

The CHAIRMAN. A judge of the circuit court of appeals issued the injunction, is that correct?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Circuit court.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the name of that judge?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Judge Leland W. Carr.

The CHAIRMAN. Your circuit court is a trial court, is it not?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the highest trial court in the State, is it not?

Mr. CREIGHTON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. From there on up you have your appellate courts?

Mr. CREIGHTON. The supreme court is the only higher court.

The CHAIRMAN. He had issued an injunction restraining these men from carrying out their activities; that is, from using duress in restraining nonstrikers from entering the plant?

Mr. CREIGHTON. They were granted the right to strike and picket peacefully.

The CHAIRMAN. And they were charged with having violated that injunction, is that a fact?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And then they were cited for contempt, were they not?

Mr. CREIGHTON. I believe that would be the technical charge.

The CHAIRMAN. Anyway, under warrants issued, it was the duty of the sheriff to arrest these men?

Mr. CREIGHTON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And he did arrest some of them between 12 o'clock at night and daylight, and place them in jail?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. He did not arrest Washburn?

Mr. CREIGHTON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. On this particular morning he had not arrested Washburn?

Mr. CREIGHTON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the picketers was Mr. Washburn's wife; is that correct? Do you know that?

Mr. CREIGHTON. I do not know whether she was ever a picket or not.

The CHAIRMAN. So that the occasion of this demonstration was in protest against the action of the court and the action of the sheriff; is not that true?

Mr. CREIGHTON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. These people who were charged with violating this injunction were incarcerated in the jail that following morning; they were in the jail, were they not?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And there were 2,000 people surrounding the jail?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And what were the police doing?

Mr. CREIGHTON. The police were all massed in the corridor of the city hall which leads to the cell block. They were placed there largely to prevent a jail delivery, if one was contemplated.

The CHAIRMAN. Was Mr. Washburn, in the speeches he made, denouncing the court and the sheriff for their action?

Mr. CREIGHTON. His denunciation centered pretty largely on the sheriff because of the fact that he had arrested these people at night.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you hear references by Washburn to the arbitrary and dictatorial action of the court?

Mr. CREIGHTON. That was the spirit of the day.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the spirit of the day. Did any of these flying squads close down any places of business?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, they did. They closed down the State Journal.

The CHAIRMAN. The State Journal is the newspaper that you work for?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And they closed down what else?

Mr. CREIGHTON. The J. W. Knapp Department Store, which is one of the largest in town. They were sent to close up the Franklin Decline Printery. It is a private concern but happens to be the State printing office. They have a contract for the State printing. That office did not close. They appealed directly to the Governor who by that time of day had arrived.

The CHAIRMAN. We will get to the Governor in a moment. The point that I am now wanting to bring out is your description of what they did in the way of closing these various places of business.

Mr. CREIGHTON. The procedure was to send flying squads of designated numbers—say 100 here or 200, whatever the occasion seemed to warrant—and in the case of the department store, they formed a shoulder-to-shoulder line in front of the store, so as to make it rather difficult if not impossible for anybody to get in. The store shortly after closed for the reason that any prospective customers were frightened away and it did not take very long for every business in the downtown area to close immediately, because the owners were a little apprehensive as to what might happen. There was not a policeman in sight.

The CHAIRMAN. There was not a policeman in sight?

Mr. CREIGHTON. I did not see a policeman.

The CHAIRMAN. Were there any State police in sight?

Mr. CREIGHTON. I did not see any State police or local police. I did not see a policeman all day long.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not see any of them all day long; either State or local police, is that correct?

Mr. CREIGHTON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. So, as a matter of fact, places of business were closed?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. By these flying squads, that you are talking about here, the ones that were armed with clubs?

Mr. CREIGHTON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us how they closed the State Journal?

Mr. CREIGHTON. They walked in the front door with clubs. The leaders immediately separated at the door and said, "Close up; close up;" and of course we had known they were coming. It is several blocks to the capitol and there was quite an advance warning that they were on their way. Inside of about 10 minutes the plant was closed and the presses were stopped. The switchboard was out. Nothing was going on.

The CHAIRMAN. So your newspaper plant was closed down?

Mr. CREIGHTON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Under compulsion?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you get out your first edition after that?

Mr. CREIGHTON. We missed one edition. The home edition came out at the usual time, around 3:15 in the afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you succeed in reopening your plant?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Several of the leaders of the group that came down went into a conference with the management of the paper. It was not generally known then what the terms were, except we were given

written permission to reopen. They had granted that we were fair to labor.

The CHAIRMAN. In your home edition, that night, did you print a box showing that an agreement had been made?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. At what time of the day did the Governor arrive at the capitol? It was on Monday, was it not?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. At what time of the day did the Governor arrive at the capitol?

Mr. CREIGHTON. About 10 minutes to 1, I should say.

The CHAIRMAN. By what route did he come to the capitol?

Mr. CREIGHTON. He had to come over a circuitous route because downtown was blocked. Normally he would have come through the business section to get to the capitol, but he could not come that way and had to come around on the outskirts.

The CHAIRMAN. Through the street you referred to a moment ago in the rear of the capitol?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Would that cause him to pass through the campus of the college?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir; he did. He came over the highway from Detroit to Lansing, passing through East Lansing, and that goes along the campus of the college.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether, or not, the Governor stopped in East Lansing?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir; he did.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose did he stop?

Mr. CREIGHTON. He stopped at the State headquarters of the State of Michigan police to confer with high-ranking officials out there.

The CHAIRMAN. How far is that from the capitol?

Mr. CREIGHTON. It is 3 miles to the capitol.

The CHAIRMAN. Where are the headquarters of the State police situated with reference to the campus of the college?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Perhaps a quarter of a mile west of it. That is toward Lansing. You go through East Lansing to the State headquarters which are nearby.

The CHAIRMAN. How far is that from the campus?

Mr. CREIGHTON. I do not know how far the college property extends, but it is not more than a quarter of a mile from the nearest building of the college.

The CHAIRMAN. So the Governor arrived at the capitol about 1 o'clock.

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What happened when he arrived?

Mr. CREIGHTON. As soon as he arrived, he summoned Mr. Washburn and one or two other leaders of the forces to his office, but they had no sooner closed the door than the crowd gathered outside the capitol and began to cheer for him and call for him. He came out immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean—that he came out from the conference immediately?

Mr. CREIGHTON. The conference had not started. He had only got in the door. As soon as the group in front were advised, or when the crowd on the porticoes, was advised, he was there, he came out.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was with the Governor when he came out from his conference?

Mr. CREIGHTON. He walked alone. As a matter of fact, he has a State police bodyguard, but they were asked not to go with him, and they did not go with him. He walked alone.

The CHAIRMAN. How far did he walk?

Mr. CREIGHTON. He walked down a flight of stairs, down to a place in the capitol overlooking the crowd.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were you with reference to the Governor?

Mr. CREIGHTON. About 6 inches back of him.

The CHAIRMAN. What was your purpose in being there?

Mr. CREIGHTON. So I would not miss hearing what he would say.

The CHAIRMAN. You did hear him clearly?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you take down his speech?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Not verbatim.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you take down any exact excerpts*from the speech?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You were taking notes as a newspaper reporter?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In order to telephone them to your paper.

Mr. CREIGHTON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you write shorthand?

Mr. CREIGHTON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you write it?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Of course, all newspaper reporters have a method by which they make notes and read them.

The CHAIRMAN. You were making notes covering the high lights of his speech?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When you made the notes, what did you do?

Mr. CREIGHTON. I went to the nearest telephone, called the office, and read the story, or dictated the story.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it published in the paper?

Mr. CREIGHTON. It was a composite story, and it was published exactly as I telephoned it.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have the notes of this story?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir; I came prepared. I have no notes but have a copy of the paper printing it, containing the story.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you in a position to say that the statement therein contained is the statement made by the Governor at that time?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you kindly read that to the committee? Read it slowly so we can understand it.

Mr. CREIGHTON. That is an excerpt from the story itself on the general situation.

The CHAIRMAN. It contains an exact quotation from the speech of the Governor?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Read it to us.

Mr. CREIGHTON (reading) :

As crowds of union workers milled about the downtown streets in front of stores, theaters, and officers that had closed and bolted their doors at the union's request, Gov. Frank Murphy summoned to his office in the capitol this afternoon all persons involved in the situation for a conference. Before the conference started he addressed a huge crowd of "holiday" participants from the balcony of his office at the capitol.

It is a small matter, but he did not speak from the balcony. As a matter of fact, he spoke from the steps of the capitol far below.

Returning to the story:

"I am urging those in government and in industry to recognize new conditions," the Governor said.

"There will be no injustices practiced upon you while the Governor can prevent it. It is not necessary for you to do one extreme or unnecessary thing. You know you will get your rights."

The Governor referred to the fact that permission had been asked of him for Homer Martin, president of the U. A. W., to speak during the afternoon in front of the capitol.

"I will be very happy to have Mr. Martin speak here," the Governor said, "but any citizen can speak from this capitol."

"We may have our differences, but as long as we keep our heads clear and our hearts right, we can guarantee all men their civil rights."

"This Government must protect you against arbitrary and dictatorial judgments if it is to see it through. I don't think this capitol could be put to better use than to give all the people the right of free speech and free assembly."

The CHAIRMAN. That was the principal part of his speech.

Mr. CREIGHTON. Outside of a general welcome to all those gathered at the capitol.

The CHAIRMAN. Referring to dictatorial and arbitrary judgments, concerning which the Governor said he would protect the people against, he had in mind the judgment rendered by Judge Carr whom you testified about a moment ago?

Mr. CREIGHTON. I think it would be a reasonable inference that that was the reference. It was the only injunction in existence at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the reason the crowd had assembled there.

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In a protest against what they said was a dictatorial and arbitrary judgment.

Mr. CREIGHTON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. In your previous testimony I believe you said that Washburn had denounced the arbitrary dictatorial judgment, referring to the judgment of Judge Carr and the action of the sheriff in arresting those people.

Mr. CREIGHTON. He was referring chiefly to the sheriff.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you present when the more than 2,000 people marched on the college?

Mr. CREIGHTON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not follow them there?

Mr. CREIGHTON. I did not follow them, but I saw them leaving.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know of your own knowledge what took place there?

Mr. CREIGHTON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you do thereafter?

Mr. CREIGHTON. During the demonstration at the college, I had then gone back to the office, the Governor having left, and I was doing a rewrite. I knew there would be difficulty out there. I was, therefore, in the office of the newspaper plant.

The CHAIRMAN. State whether, or not, the Governor thereafter held a press conference.

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir; he holds them twice a day.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you recall the press conference held some 2 weeks later?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Very clearly.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you present at that conference?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Was this holiday discussed then?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir; the question was raised. I do not recall the connection in which the matter was again brought up, but I remember that it was discussed because we were rather curious as to his understanding of the origin of the demonstration.

The CHAIRMAN. What did the Governor say on that occasion as to the origin of this demonstration?

Mr. CREIGHTON. He said he believed that it had been conceived and engineered by Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you report that to your paper?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir; I reported it, and it was carried in the noon edition. I do not remember the date.

The CHAIRMAN. As to Mr. Washburn, whom you testified about, and who was directing the groups, I believe you said that he was one of those for whom a warrant had been issued.

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And they later arrested him, did they not?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir; he was arrested. I think that he voluntarily submitted to arrest.

The CHAIRMAN. He was not arrested during the holiday?

Mr. CREIGHTON. No, sir; it was 2 or 3 days following.

The CHAIRMAN. Two or three days afterward he voluntarily surrendered?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he tried?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he convicted?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he appeal?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir; he appealed to the State supreme court, and the conviction was upheld.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether, or not, they are now appealing to the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. CREIGHTON. Yes, sir; and the State sentence has been suspended pending decision of the Federal constitutional questions involved.

The CHAIRMAN. Was this so-called arbitrary and dictatorial judgment affirmed by the highest court of the State?

Mr. CREIGHTON. His conviction was affirmed.

The CHAIRMAN. I have here some telegrams of protest and denial that I have received, and we will hand them to any member of the

press who are interested in them. These telegrams are from Carl Kiser; Randolph Merriweather, secretary and business manager of the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association; editors of New Republic, by Bruce Bliven; Upton Sinclair; Maritime Federation, Pacific, by Bruce Hannon, secretary and treasurer; and Rollin L. McNitt, dean of Southwestern University School of Law, Los Angeles.

That concludes the testimony, and we thank you very much for appearing.

The committee will not meet this afternoon, but it will meet tomorrow. I do not know whether we will meet in the morning or afternoon, but we will advise the press as to that. This afternoon the Chair will prepare a letter in answer to Mr. Robert Jackson's communication, and will also answer the telegrams of two members of the committee. The press can have them some time this afternoon.

The committee will now stand adjourned.

(Thereupon, the committee adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 28, 1938, at a time to be fixed by the chairman.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1938

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO
INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Before we proceed with the witnesses this morning, the Chair wants to place in the record a letter addressed to Robert H. Jackson, Solicitor General, Department of Justice, dated October 29, 1938. That letter has been given to the press, but I want to hand it to the reporter so it will be incorporated in the record.

(Said letter is as follows:)

OCTOBER 29, 1938.

ROBERT H. JACKSON, Esq.,
*Solicitor General, Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. JACKSON: This is to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of October 26, 1938, in which you invite me to assist you in presenting the *Strecker* case to the Supreme Court.

From my study of the record in this case I think that the Department of Justice certainly needs some assistance. I am confident that you are not acquainted with many important facts in this case which clearly demonstrate that Madame Perkins, Secretary of Labor, is endeavoring to use you and the Department of Justice to "pull her chestnuts out of the fire." My reasons for holding this opinion are as follows:

1. That the Department of Justice was induced to appeal this case from the decision of the circuit court of appeals when that court only ordered that it should be remanded for a new trial.

2. That the Department of Justice, in perfecting its appeal from the fifth circuit, was led to agree to a stipulation of facts ignoring an important finding by Turner W. Battle, Assistant to the Secretary of Labor, in the deportation warrant of Strecker.

3. That this agreed stipulation of facts restricted the issues before the Supreme Court to a single question, to wit, was membership in the Communist Party in 1932 for a short while sufficient in itself to justify the deportation of Strecker? And the agreed stipulation ignored the evidence in the record which sustained a finding by Turner W. Battle, Assistant to the Secretary of Labor, that Strecker believed in and taught the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States, which allegation was and is, under the act, sufficient in and of itself to justify the deportation of Strecker, if supported by any evidence.

4. That the records of the Labor Department clearly show that Madame Frances Perkins misrepresented to our committee the facts and the law upon the basis of which she claims to have deferred further proceedings against Harry Bridges, and misrepresented the effect which the decision in the *Strecker* case had upon the deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges.

5. That the Labor Department files reveal a strong bias on the part of Madame Frances Perkins and the Department of Labor, in favor of Harry Bridges, and an effort on their part to protect, rather than to deport him.

6. That, as head of the Labor Department, Madame Frances Perkins is endeavoring to throw the *Strecker case*, in order to save Harry Bridges, a Communist and alien labor leader, in violation of the laws of the United States, the decisions of our Federal courts, and her oath of office.

As proof of the statements heretofore made I submit the following excerpts from the records of the Department of Labor in the *Harry Bridges case* from the record on appeal in the *Strecker case*.

In support of my first charge on page 118 of the record on appeal in the case of Joseph George Strecker, there appears the following extract from the minutes of the fifth circuit court of appeals, under date of June 7, 1938:

"The judgment of reversal is amended to read, 'Reversed, with directions to try the issues de novo as suggested in Ex Parte Fierstein (41 Fed. (2d), p. 54).'"

In other words, when the Department of Justice was induced to appeal this case from the decision of the circuit court of appeals, it was not a final judgment in favor of Strecker, but was simply an order of the fifth circuit remanding the case to the district court for a new trial. It is obvious, from the decision of Judge Hutcheson, which appears in the record at page 110, that—

"The evidence, and the only evidence relied on for the finding and order is that during the Presidential campaign of 1932, when one Foster was running as the white, and one Ford as the colored candidate of the Communist Party of America, for President of the United States, appellant, in November 1932 became a member of the Communist Party and accepted certain literature of the Communist Party for distribution. * * * None of the literature which he was supposed to have circulated in 1932 was introduced, but his book of membership in the Communist Party in the United States was. Not a word in his membership book advocated, incited, or even suggested that the Government of the United States should be overthrown by force or violence. * * * The record contained also, offered by the Bureau, extracts from a copy of the Communist dated April 1934, 'eighth convention issue, a magazine of the theory and practices of Marxism and Leninism, published monthly by the Communist Party in the United States of America.' Not a single extract from this magazine referred to the Government of the United States of America directly or indirectly."

In other words, the finding against the Government in the *Strecker case* by the fifth circuit was due to the fact that inadequate evidence was offered as to the character of the Communist Party, and proof was not introduced in evidence that the Communist Party believed in, advised, advocated, or taught the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States.

In view of the foregoing, the letter of Gerard D. Reilly, solicitor of labor, dated April 16, 1938, and addressed to the Attorney General of the United States, is proof that the Department of Labor knew that the usual evidence introduced in deportation cases was omitted at the hearing of Strecker, and, therefore, was not a part of the record in this case, although such proof had been commonly used in other cases involving deportation of persons belonging to the Communist Party.

In Mr. Reilly's letter to the Attorney General of the United States, he said: "In the instant case, however, the Government introduced as documentary exhibits both the membership book of the alien which contained some statements of Communist theory and a copy of the April 1934 issue of a periodical entitled 'The Communist—A Magazine of the Theory and Practice of Marxism-Leninism.' Selected excerpts from this magazine were also read into the record. While it is true that since the manifesto of the Communist International and the constitution of the Communist Party of America (apparently the stock exhibits considered by other circuit courts of appeal) were not introduced, the argument might be advanced that the articles in this magazine are not necessarily the official teachings of the Communist Party, there is no doubt that the magazine was written or printed matter circulated and published by the party, since the masthead states that it is published monthly by the Communist Party of the United States of America."

In other words, there is positive and absolute proof in Mr. Reilly's letter to the Attorney General of the United States that certain stock exhibits, proving

the character of the Communist Party, were omitted in the proof against Strecker, and that such exhibits had previously been used in other cases.

It follows that when the Department of Justice appealed the Strecker decision, it turned down an opportunity to retry the case and introduce the usual evidence customarily offered to prove the official teachings of the Communist Party. Nevertheless, at the instance and request of the solicitor of labor, the aforesaid Gerard D. Reilly, the Department of Justice chose rather to appeal a doubtful case when it might, by a new trial, have presented the complete facts to the court, which would have avoided the necessity of an appeal to the Supreme Court.

In support of the second statement which I have heretofore made, I desire to call your attention to the fact that in September 1938 you filed a petition for a writ of certiorari in the Supreme Court of the United States in which you stated that the question presented to the Supreme Court is, "whether the court erred in failing to sustain an order of deportation against respondent, an alien who in 1932 became a member of the Communist Party of the United States."

You have stated that the "specification of errors to be urged" in the Supreme Court are:

"(1) In holding that an alien who in 1932 became a member of the Communist Party is not by reason of that fact subject to deportation under the act of October 18, 1918, as amended by the act of June 5, 1920 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 137); (2) in holding that the evidence before the Secretary of Labor concerning the principles of the Communist Party was insufficient to sustain the order of deportation; (3) in remanding the case for a trial de novo in the district court; (4) in failing to affirm the judgment of the district court in the *Strecker case*."

The agreed statement contained in your petition for a writ of certiorari (p. 5) omits the finding of Turner W. Battle, Assistant to the Secretary of Labor, in the deportation warrant that Strecker should be deported "in that he believes in and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States" (although this point was urged by the United States attorney in his petition for rehearing) and includes only the fact that "after his entry he was found (R. 114-115) to have become a member of one of the classes of aliens enumerated in section 1 of the act, as amended, to wit, an alien who is a member of or affiliated with an organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, or teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States."

In other words, in your agreed statement in the petition for a writ of certiorari you have omitted an important finding by the assistant to the Secretary of Labor in the deportation warrant and apparently sought to narrow the issues on appeal to the question of membership in the Communist Party of the United States.

In doing this you were undoubtedly guided by the statement contained in the letter of Mr. Reilly, heretofore referred to, addressed to the Attorney General of the United States, under date of April 16, 1938, wherein he stated: "That portion of the court's decision relating to the first count in the warrant, namely, that the alien's own statements of his political and economic beliefs did not indicate that he himself believed, taught, or advocated the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence, is of little significance except to the peculiar facts of the case. It should be pointed out, however, that irrespective of an alien's personal views, the statute makes deportable aliens who are members of organizations that believe, advise, advocate, and teach the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States, or organizations which circulate literature to the same effect. * * * It is this phase of the opinion which makes the holding an important one and raises the question of a conflict with the rules of decision in other circuit courts of appeal. While it is true, as the appellate court noted, that the statute itself makes no mention of the Communist Party, it has been a settled practice in the Immigration and Naturalization Service for many years to regard that party as an organization coming within the language of the statute, and until this decision the various circuit courts of appeal which have passed on the question have generally found that where membership in the Communist Party was established, that fact alone was sufficient evidence to support a deportation order—at least if there was evidence in the record of the official literature published and circulated by the party. (The necessity for this last requirement was stressed in *Ex Parte Fierstein*, 41 Fed. (2d) 53, C. C. A. 9, 1930.)"

It appears from the foregoing quotation that you were induced by the Solicitor of the Department of Labor to take an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States on a question which he himself admits was not properly presented to the Court, and that you have omitted from urging (as did the United States attorney in his petition for rehearing) the fact that competent and material evidence was introduced showing that Strecker believed in and taught the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

In support of the third statement which I have made, your petition omits the finding of Turner W. Battle, assistant to the Secretary of Labor, in the deportation warrant, to the effect that Strecker should be deported "in that he believes in and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States," and thus obviously attempts to restrict the Supreme Court to a consideration of the single question, to wit: Was membership in the Communist Party in 1932 in and of itself sufficient to justify the deportation of Strecker?

Although the record on appeal contains ample evidence to support the finding of Turner W. Battle that Strecker did believe in and teach the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States, you have failed to make this an equal issue before the Supreme Court of the United States.

Even if the Supreme Court of the United States should hold that Strecker's membership in the Communist Party in 1932 did not in and of itself constitute sufficient ground for his deportation, still, if the Supreme Court should find (assuming that that question was properly presented) that Strecker was one who believed in and taught the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States, then the Supreme Court would have to reverse the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and sustain Judge Borah in refusing Strecker's application for a writ of habeas corpus, which would automatically result in the deportation of Strecker.

As proof of the statements which I have just made, I quote herewith excerpts from the testimony of Joseph George Strecker at a hearing conducted at Hot Springs, Ark., on October 25, 1933, before Immigration Inspector Carroll D. Paul, and also from his statement before Acting District Director Walter L. Wolfe on September 16, 1933:

"Q. Are you a member of any organization or society, social, fraternal, or political?—A. I was a member of the Communist Party of America.

"Q. What do you mean you were a member of the Communist Party of America?—A. Well, I haven't paid my dues since February 1933.

"Q. Have you notified the organization that you were withdrawing from it?—A. No.

Q. Have you had a change of heart or mind in the matter, or have you simply failed to pay your dues?—A. Just failed to pay my dues.

"Q. Then you still feel the same as you did at the time of your initiation?—A. Yes.

"Q. Have you ever become a member of any organization without first acquainting yourself with its intents and purposes?—A. No.

"Q. Is this your membership book in the Communist Party of the United States [presenting membership book, No. 2844, issued November 15, 1932, to Joe Strecker]?—A. Yes.

"Q. Were you at the time of your initiation into the Communist Party familiar with its intents and purposes?—A. Yes.

"Q. How did you acquire this prior knowledge of communism?—A. From a study of the writings of Marx.

"Q. How long have you studied the writings of Marx?—A. About 10 years.

"Q. Are you in accord with Marx in regard to the social order of things?—A. Yes.

"Q. Will you tell me what the aims and purposes of the Communist Party of America are?—A. Yes; it proposes to destroy capitalism and establish a government by the people.

"Q. Do you mean a government similar to that now in existence in Russia?—A. Exactly.

"Q. What means will the Communist Party of America use to attain its purpose?—A. I do not know what will be necessary.

"Q. Will it resort to armed force in the event that should be necessary?—A. That is what they say.

"Q. Who says that?—A. The leaders of communism.

"Q. Do you mean the local leaders, the national leaders, or those in Russia?—A. All of them.

"Q. Do you think that the present form of government in the United States should be destroyed and a communistic or Russian form of government established in the United States?—A. I think that the destruction of capitalism is inevitable and that the sooner it comes the better off we shall all be.

Q. Would you personally bear arms against the present United States Government?—A. Not at this time.

"Q. Why not at this time?—A. Because communism is not strong enough now.

"Q. Supposing that the majority of the populace of the United States were Communists, and were certain of a victory over capitalism in an armed conflict, would you then personally bear arms against the present Government?—A. Certainly; I would be a fool to get myself killed fighting for capitalism.

"Q. Have you ever been in the military service of any country?—A. No.

"Q. Have you done any work for the Communistic Party since becoming a member?—A. All I have done was to hand out some papers.

"Q. Where did you obtain these papers?—A. From the headquarters in Kansas City.

"Q. What was the nature of this literature?—A. It was something calling upon the people to unite.

"Q. To unite for what?—A. Against capitalism.

"Q. When you speak of capitalism, do you mean the present form of Government of the United States?—A. It is all the same thing.

"Q. Did you circulate this literature that was sent you?—A. I gave it to some other people to circulate.

"Q. Will you name them?—A. I have forgotten who it was.

"Q. What was your purpose in filing your petition for citizenship in the United States?—A. I thought I would have more protection if I was a citizen of the United States.

"Q. Protection from what?—A. From the law.

"Q. Isn't it a fact that your party leader advised you not to become too active in that you might be subject to deportation from the United States?—A. Something like that.

"Q. Is that the reason you stopped paying your dues?—A. No.

"Q. In the event the Communist Party of America attains sufficient power or proportion to be of service to you, will you pay up your back dues and go along with them?—A. Certainly.

"Q. What is the name and address of your nearest relative in Austria?—A. My wife, Sofia Strecker, Kamionka Strum, Austria.

"Q. Have you any further statement to make?—A. No.

"Q. Is it true, as reported to the Government, that you have been distributing communistic literature?—A. A tailor from Little Rock handed me some of this literature and I handed it to somebody else, but I do not know the name of the person or persons to whom I handed it.

"Q. Is it not true that at one time you had a considerable quantity of communistic literature in your home?—A. I have received letters from New York urging me to buy gold bonds of the Communist Government in Russia.

"Q. Have you ever bought any of these bonds?—A. Yes, I have bought 2,200 rubles' worth of the Soviet Union Socialist Republic, for which I paid in American money the sum of \$1,588.

"Q. When did you make this purchase?—A. About 2 months ago. It was represented to me that the United States Government's money would soon be worthless, or at best very cheap, and I thought it wise for my own protection to put my money into bonds of the present Russian Soviet Government. These bonds are paying interest in gold dollars American money.

"Q. Do you now deny on your oath that you are a Communist at heart?—A. I do not consider myself a Communist, because I am not paying dues to the Communist Party. I do not know whether we shall ever have a communistic system in the United States. I have read Marx's books and Marx states that sooner or later there will be a red government in every country in the world. I am trying to protect myself and that is why I bought the bonds of the Russian Government. I do not know what is going to happen; I do not know how long I am going to live. If I knew when I was going to die, I would get me about four women and have a hell of a time before I die. If communism comes in this country, I will not be against it, because I have got to go with the people, and whatever the people want I will have to go along with them. * * *

In support of my fourth proposition that Madame Frances Perkins has misrepresented to our committee facts and the law upon the basis of which she claims to have deferred further proceedings against Harry Bridges, I direct your attention to her letter to me of August 30, 1938, in which she said:

"You are incorrect in saying that the facts in the two cases (the *Strecker case* and the *Bridges case*) are dissimilar. As a matter of fact they are identical except for the fact that Strecker admitted that he was a Communist and that he distributed Communist literature, where Bridges has not so admitted. In other words, the case in regard to Strecker was much stronger."

Such a statement is preposterous. There were never two cases identical; and her contention that the *Strecker case* is a stronger case than the one which the Department of Labor has against Bridges is not only not sustained by her own records but is contradicted by them. To illustrate: On April 20, 1938, James L. Houghteling, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, of the Department of Labor, at Washington, D. C., received the following wire from R. P. Bonham, district director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service at Seattle, Wash., in which wire Mr. Bonham said to Mr. Houghteling:

"Radio news announces your continuance Bridges hearing until Supreme Court decides New Orleans case. Hope this is incorrect as difficult protect our witnesses indefinitely. I have examined entire record testimony and the court decisions said case. Service failed introduce adequate proof party teaches violence. We have ample such evidence both in current official party documents and on part of witnesses. New Orleans case weak and devoid proper proof therefore not hurtful or controlling our case. Hope same will not be regarded as precedent or of sufficient consequence postponing pending case. Please wire instructions.

"BONHAM."

On the confirmation of the above telegram which was forwarded by Mr. Bonham to Mr. Houghteling, appears this further statement by Mr. Bonham:

"DEAR MR. HOUGHTELING: The *Strecker case* is very weak, consisting more of inference than evidence. The Court's decision is based, I think, upon the proposition that we can't deport just because an alien is proved to be a member of the Communist Party, but that we must also prove that said organization teaches or prints or displays matter advocating violent overthrow of our Government. Case rests only on the absence of such facts or proof, and not upon any fundamental question. The case was remanded for further proceedings. What could that mean except for evidence of violent revolution doctrines of the said organization? An appeal will not cure the situation in my judgment but rather complicate it.

"Sincerely,

"R. P. BONHAM,
"District Director."

Mr. Bonham is a veteran in the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Labor Department, and has been described in a letter by Mr. Houghteling to Edward W. Cahill, district commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, under date of April 21, 1938, "as keenly devoted to his duty as he sees it."

Further, Mr. Bonham, in a letter under date of May 9, 1938, to Mr. Houghteling, said:

"I have always been able to introduce these books to prove the charge that the alien belongs to an organization that printed and published, etc., literature advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. The courts have, without exception, dismissed writs challenging this procedure in cases which I have conducted. The witnesses we had assembled for the Bridges hearing had among them some former functionaries of the party who were well informed and who would have testified to the Communist Party of the United States of America being the American section of the Comintern (Communist International) and to the definite commitment to force and violence in bringing about the overthrow of our Government."

Madame Frances Perkins' experience and judgment on immigration and naturalization matters are of no value, as against the experience and judgment of District Director Bonham, who has devoted many years exclusively to immigration and naturalization matters, and has been responsible for the preparation of the case against Harry Bridges.

A second illustration of the misrepresentation of Madame Frances Perkins is found in her letter, as follows:

"This Department has recommended that this decision (Strecker) be appealed to the Supreme Court since it was recognized at once not only by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and the Solicitor of this Department, but by officials of the Department of Justice with whom they conferred, that unless this holding were reversed by the highest court, that the charges brought against Bridges even if proved had no legal significance whatsoever."

This statement of Madame Frances Perkins is contrary to the statement previously quoted from the letter of the Solicitor of the Department of Labor to the Attorney General of the United States, wherein he said:

"Until this decision the various circuit courts of appeal which have passed on the question have generally found that where membership in the Communist Party was established, that fact alone was sufficient evidence to support a deportation order—at least if there was evidence in the record of the official literature published and circulated by the party."

Madame Frances Perkins' statement, that unless the *Strecker case* were reversed in the Supreme Court "the charges brought against Bridges, even if proved, had no legal significance whatsoever," is so ridiculous as hardly to require answering. Numerous decisions holding contrary to the Strecker decision have been rendered by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, which would have jurisdiction of the *Bridges case*; and yet, Madame Frances Perkins, in her letter would represent that a decision of the fifth circuit, in New Orleans, La., unless it was reversed by the Supreme Court of the United States would be authoritative against many decisions holding to the contrary in the ninth circuit. The Department of Justice knows, the Solicitor of the Labor Department knows, and Madame Frances Perkins ought to know that a circuit court of appeals which has passed upon a subject is bound by its own decisions and not by the decisions of some other circuit. Such a misrepresentation by the Secretary of Labor is inexcusable.

Furthermore, the records in the Department of Labor contain a teletype copy of a story which was sent by Mr. Beall to the managing editor of the New York Herald Tribune, as follows:

"In regard to the Bridges story I would like to say that Senator Copeland yesterday told a group of about eight reporters that the story in the Herald Tribune had been substantially correct, and that Mr. Reilly had told the committee that the Department had a case which should result in the deportation of Bridges."

The above statement has never been denied by Mr. Reilly, although the statement did not appear on the published transcript of the hearing before the Senators, but occurred "off the record."

In support of my fifth statement, as you probably know, the ordinary alien against whom a complaint has been made is immediately arrested by the Department of Labor, incarcerated, and hearings are conducted, without delay, by inspectors of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to ascertain whether or not he is an alien who is deportable under the law, while in the case of Harry Bridges, months and years have transpired since the first complaints were filed against him.

As evidence of the favored position occupied by Harry Bridges, although he has been under investigation for many years, the Department of Labor has never as yet had a hearing to develop the facts with respect to him and has refused and ignored repeated requests of individuals, patriotic organizations, and even its own district director to proceed with the Bridges deportation hearings.

Furthermore, the Labor Department's files clearly indicate that Harry Bridges is treated very differently from the ordinary alien who is illegally in the United States, as evidenced by a letter from R. P. Bonham, under date of September 23, 1937, to Edward J. Shaughnessy, Assistant Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, in which Mr. Bonham said:

"I believe it proper that I acquaint the central office with the fact that when I interviewed Mr. Bridges some time ago on another matter he boasted that he had seen the central office file relating to himself and also that 'they' had an excellent 'intelligence' organization of their own that kept them well informed of what was going on. Several of the witnesses in behalf of the Government are fearful of their lives if ahead of the hearing the fact of their having to testify

becomes known to the alien or Communists. There will be no leak at this end, and may I not, in order that their lives may not be unduly endangered, adjure the central office and the Department to observe the greatest precautions to safeguard inviolate this record?"

As further evidence of the favored position occupied by Harry Bridges with the Department of Labor, in the memorandum of Mr. Houghteling to the Secretary of Labor under the date of April 14, 1938, Mr. Houghteling suggests as one reason for postponing the Bridges hearing the following:

"If we go ahead with the hearing scheduled for the 25th and the Supreme Court should later affirm the action of the circuit court of appeals in the *Strecker case*, the Department might be charged with 'smearing' Harry Bridges unnecessarily."

This fear on the part of the Department of Labor lest it might "smear" this alien Communist, who has been illegally within the United States since 1920, is evidence of more than bias in his favor.

As further evidence of the favored position enjoyed by Harry Bridges and the consideration shown to him by the Department of Labor, it appears from the records of this Department that a Mr. Pressman, apparently the legal adviser of Harry Bridges, requested the Department by letter on April 12, 1938, for a "so-called bill of particulars as to the reasons underlying the institution of proceedings against Mr. Bridges."

Commenting on this request, in a memorandum for the Solicitor, dated April 14, 1938, T. B. Shoemaker, Deputy Commissioner, said:

"The basic thought is that the Department would be less likely to be criticized from any sources if it adhered strictly to the long-established practice in warrant proceedings and did not depart therefrom for this or any other particular case."

In longhand, on the margin of this letter, is found the following statement:

"I do not entirely agree but matter can be postponed until case is set down for hearing again. G. D. R." (G. D. R. are the initials of Mr. Reilly.)

Further light is thrown on the attitude of prominent officials of the Department of Labor in the letter from Edward W. Cahill, District Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization at San Francisco, Calif., to James L. Houghteling, Commissioner, wherein the following significant language was used:

"Before we bury this case (*Bridges case*) may I just present this sequence of facts."

On the same day, April 21, 1938, Mr. Houghteling, writing to Mr. Cahill, said:

"Because of the reproof which I was obliged to administer therein to Mr. Bonham's excessive zeal and bad judgment in putting into the record his telegram prejudging the action of the central office, I request that you destroy this copy after reading it; you may, however, show it to Mr. Haff, whom I wish to keep in touch with the developments in this situation. Because Raphael Bonham is so keenly devoted to his duty as he sees it I should not want a knowledge of this gentle reprimand to go beyond yourself and Mr. Haff."

Finally, on February 8, 1938, Madame Frances Perkins wrote to Harry Bridges a personal letter in which she said:

"Should the Department proceed with hearings, it does not mean that it has adopted the view that the evidence which the complaining witnesses have submitted is necessarily trustworthy."

The reasonable presumption, from the foregoing, is that there was a disposition on the part of some of the higher officials of the Department of Labor, including the Solicitor and Secretary Perkins to accord special consideration to Harry Bridges.

Finally, although it was recommended by R. P. Bonham, District Director and by R. J. Norene, Divisional Director, in an application for a warrant for the arrest of Harry Bridges dated on September 22, 1937, that an averment be included in the Harry Bridges warrant that he believed in, advised, advocated, and taught the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States, this averment was omitted from the warrant of arrest that was issued by the Department of Labor. This omission by the Department of Labor, in the face of the recommendation of its district and divisional directors, can only be interpreted as an intentional effort to so limit the charges against Harry Bridges that it may be possible for him to escape deportation.

In proof of the sixth averment, I direct your attention to the following chain of events which I have previously established, through documentary evidence:

1. That the Department of Labor induced the Department of Justice to appeal a case imperfectly presented before the district court, in that certain exhibits were omitted as evidence; when the Department of Labor was only required under the decision of the circuit court to have re-tried the issues and submitted this additional proof.

2. That this appeal has been perfected, unnecessarily, by the Department of Justice, at the request of the Department of Labor, to delay the deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges; and with the hope that an adverse decision by the Supreme Court in the *Strecker case* might destroy the pending case against Harry Bridges.

3. That the documentary evidence heretofore submitted shows an overwhelming bias on the part of the Department of Labor in favor of Harry Bridges.

4. Finally, my examination of the petition for a writ of certiorari filed by the Department of Justice in this case, convinces me that this petition for a writ of certiorari was prepared in the office of Madame Perkins, by her Solicitor, Mr. Reilly, and that the fine hand of Mrs. Perkins is revealed not only in the taking of an imperfect case to the Supreme Court, but also in the omission of an important issue in that appeal that was taken.

Understand, Mr. Solicitor General, this is not an attack upon you, but is an effort to show the deception which has been perpetrated upon the Department of Justice.

In view of the foregoing, if it is still your desire that I should appear before the Supreme Court, or that our committee should file a brief therein, I will try if possible to do so, either personally, as suggested by you, or in lieu thereof, endeavor to furnish you with the assistance of eminent counsel, to assist you in the presentation of this case.

I have an abiding faith in the wisdom, courage, and patriotism of the Supreme Court when all of the facts are before them.

Feeling sure that the President of the United States and Attorney General Cummings will likewise appreciate the assistance which you have solicited, and which I am tendering in the way of constructive criticism, I am sending a copy of this memorandum to each of them.

Very sincerely yours,

MARTIN DIES, M. C.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair also wishes to offer for the record an affidavit by Arthur James Kent with reference to the California situation.

(Said affidavit is as follows:)

AFFIDAVIT OF ARTHUR JAMES KENT

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

County of Los Angeles, ss:

Arthur Kent, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I make this affidavit voluntarily and of my own free will and accord and at my own initiative.

2. In the years 1932, 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936, and until September 1937, I was a member of the Communist Party; and in the years 1936 and 1937 I was a membership director for the Communist Party at San Francisco and in charge of political activity of the party.

3. I was personally acquainted with the leading members of the Communist Party in the State of California in those years.

4. I became a member of the Communist Party by joining the San Quentin unit of the party in 1931, while I was an inmate of San Quentin; and upon my release therefrom I became an active member of the party, devoting my time and energy to the interests of the party; and the leaders of the party knew that I had been in San Quentin when I was made membership director in 1936; and in the summer of 1937 I committed certain crimes in Los Angeles County and pleaded guilty thereto and now am confined in the county jail by order of the court.

5. No promise of any kind has been made to induce me to make any statements of any kind; and every statement made herein is true, accurate, and precise and is made without promise or hope of personal gain or advantage.

6. The Communist Party had a political strategy committee and this committee met with Senator Culbert Olson at Santa Maria Inn in June 1937; and the members of that particular strategy committee were Betty Gannett, Frank Spector, Mr. Tolins, Carl Rodehamel, Joseph Aidelin; and they met with Olson openly as the committee of the Communist Party; and the meeting lasted about an hour; and I saw them all meeting with Olson on the evening before the convention of the California conference for progressive legislation action, which conference had been called at the direction of the communistic leadership in California.

7. For almost a year prior thereto a strategy committee of the Communist Party (sometimes including Schneiderman, State secretary of the Communist Party, and William Plunkert, contact man between the progressive group in the California Legislature and the Communist Party, of which he has long been an important member, and now is secretary of the Federation for Political Unity, without revealing therein his position in the Communist Party; and Astor Ward, then a bailiff in the California supreme court and later an officer in the C. I. O. council in Oakland, Calif., and long an important member of the Communist Party) would meet with members of the California Legislature, particularly John G. Clark, Ellis Patterson, Jack Tenney, Ben Rosenthal, and Sam Yorty, all members of the Communist Party—and sometimes also with other sympathetic persons not actual members of the party.

These five men, John G. Clark, Ellis Patterson, Ben Rosenthal, Sam Yorty, Jack Tenney, were active members of the Communist Party through 1936 and 1937 to my positive knowledge, as membership directors in the party. Thus I had information of the membership affiliation of these persons.

I was first so advised by William Plunkert and Betty Gannett of their affiliations as members of the party.

8. I was also, in 1936 and 1937, fraction secretary of the Conference for Progressive Political Action, the fraction being all Communist Party members in Sacramento, San Francisco, Los Angeles, or elsewhere, or who were leaders in political action.

As such secretary I was instructed by the leaders of the Communist Party—Schneiderman, Spector, or Gannett—what legislative bills were to be pushed and by whom; then I would contact Leigh Athern, official secretary of the conference, and he would contact these assemblymen, or Plunkert would do so, or Lee Geyer would contact them, all as I suggested.

John G. Clark, Ellis Patterson, Sam Yorty, Ben Rosenthal, Jack Tenney were the five members of the assembly to whom Schneiderman, Spector, Gannett, Plunkert assigned such duties in the legislature, because they were our members, the members of the Communist Party in the California Assembly, and they took orders accordingly from the party leaders.

9. Further, I, myself, often met Ellis Patterson and Astor Ward in 1937 in San Francisco, Astor Ward having been particularly assigned to Patterson; and there we discussed legislation and means for passing various bills, especially the little Wagner Act, assigned by us to Yorty; and throughout these conversations, Patterson talked as a member of the Communist Party and stated that he was accepting the instruction of the party leaders as to the legislation and as to the persons who were to be ordered to work thereon; and Patterson talked of the Communist Party as his party and as our party and conducted all discussions as one member of the party talking with another.

10. Further, Plunkert often reported to me and other members of the fraction in my presence that he was meeting regularly with John G. Clark, and was instructing him in Marxism, so as to better fit him to be the leader of the Communist group in the legislature; and that he was grooming Clark to be the outstanding political leader of the Communist Party in California.

11. Further, Plunkert reported weekly, during the legislative session, to the top fraction of the Communist Party, namely, Schneiderman, Spector or Gannett, Athern, and myself, and any representation from Sacramento, such as Geyer. Plunkert's reports dealt largely with the actions taken and to be taken by Clark, Patterson, Yorty, Rosenthal, and Tenney; and with instructions to be sent to them, as the Communist Party fraction in the legislature, to be carried out by them directly or through the progressive Democrats in the legislature.

12. Further, in every discussion in this top fraction, Ellis Patterson, John G. Clark, Sam Yorty, Ben Rosenthal, and Jack Tenney were always discussed as members of the Communist Party, who were taking instruction from this top fraction for performance of duties at Sacramento.

13. At Santa Maria, all the work of the Conference for Progressive Political Action culminated and dissolved into the Labor's Non-Partisan League, under

which strategy the Communist Party planned to control the league as it now does in this State.

Prior to that time, in Santa Maria, the top fraction of the party had agreed that Senator Olson should be urged and supported by the Communist Party as the candidate for Governor; and at Santa Maria, he was invited to be the key-note of the conference.

Senator Olson knew, before the meeting at Santa Maria, that the conference was to become Labor's Non-Partisan League.

Further, with Olson's knowledge, plans were made to organize the league in every county and to proceed thereafter with complete concealment of the Communist Party affiliation.

14. Throughout the functioning of the progressive democratic group in the assembly, dominated by this Communist fraction, John G. Clark, Ellis Patterson, Sam Yorty, Ben Rosenthal, and Jack Tenney, all the bills pushed by this group were assigned to Senator Culbert L. Olson to handle in the Senate; and Senator Olson acted as the representative of these men in handling in the Senate all the legislative matters they particularly handled in the assembly; and Senator Olson frequently met with them to work out the political strategy involved in these matters.

15. I state that John G. Clark, in 1936 and 1937, was a member of the Communist Party, an active member of the Communist Party fraction at Sacramento; and his other associates in that fraction were Assemblymen Ellis Patterson, Sam Yorty, Ben Rosenthal, and Jack Tenney, all Communists; and that John G. Clark, Ellis Patterson, Tenney, Yorty, and Rosenthal took orders as Communists and, as far as I know, are still Communists, actively representing the Communist Party in California for all purposes.

16. I give the citizens of California notice that the Communist Party is creeping into the State control through John G. Clark, Communist member of the assembly, now chairman of the Democratic Party of California; through Ellis Patterson, Communist member of the assembly; through Ben Rosenthal, Sam Yorty, Jack Tenney, all assemblymen and all Communists; through the Labor's Non-Partisan League, conceived and controlled by the Communist Party; through the Federation for Political Unity, designed and controlled by Communists.

I do my duty by unmasking the hidden agents of the Communist Party in its campaign to control California.

ARTHUR KENT.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a notary public, in and for the county of Los Angeles, State of California, this 2d day of November 1938.

ROSE B. HAWLEY.

The CHAIRMAN. There is another statement the Chair wants to make: It will be recalled that when Mr. Ginrich testified before the committee, Mr. Metcalfe gave the names of two witnesses, Mr. Miller and Barbara Baker, with reference to the Silver Shirt movement, referring to Suzanne Sterling, who was reported to have received contributions from certain sources. Both witnesses were subpoenaed. Mr. Miller denied knowing anything about it. He does not want to come because he says he does not know the facts.

I have here a telegram from the other witness, Barbara Baker, dated Cleveland, Ohio, November 4, 1938, as follows:

Telegram re Monday received. Work for city Cleveland. Now 2 weeks behind in pay. Financially a problem to reach Washington. Can you wire fare in advance and guarantee all expenses incurred, including lost pay. Willingly cooperate and obey summons if you make possible.

Mr. Mosier and I, after talking it over, have decided that it would be much less difficult and more convenient to have a subcommittee meeting held in Cleveland to hear the various witnesses on the subject of the sit-down strike and other phases of communism. We find it most difficult to get witnesses to come here, because of the fact that most of them are working, and they are making more money than the committee can afford to pay them under the law. There-

fore, the bulk of those witnesses will be heard in Cleveland by a subcommittee, instead of here in Washington. That is due to the difficulty we have experienced in getting them to come here.

The subcommittee composed of Mr. Starnes, Mr. Mosier, and Mr. Thomas will go to the west coast after Armistice Day, or as soon thereafter as possible, to conduct hearings in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle. They will probably be there for 2 or 3 weeks to hear witnesses already lined up to testify, as well as others who may want to be heard.

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask this question: I understand that there are several hundred Government employees, some of whom want to be heard, who are members of or closely associated with various communistic organizations. I think we ought to have them heard if we possibly can.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has that under consideration now. I have evidence that some four or five hundred Government employees, some of whom hold key positions, are connected with organizations that have upon their boards well-known Communists and that have Communist programs to a large extent. We hope to be able to subpoena a number of those people, because that is a question of intense interest throughout the country, in view of the fact that those people are in the Government service and occupy key positions.

Mr. MOSIER. We can go into that later.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. I think we can have the subcommittee hearings in the West and subcommittee hearings at Cleveland. Then we can have hearings in some of the southern States. We have had a great many statements with reference to communism among the Negroes. Charges have been made at Birmingham, Atlanta, and New Orleans of the prevalence of communism, especially among the Negro class. We will try to have some subcommittee hearings in Atlanta, Birmingham, and New Orleans, and, perhaps, at Asheville, N. C., on Mr. Pelley's organization. We will run here all next week, except on election day. We will run on Monday. We will get rid of the witnesses we have by Thursday night, if it is possible to do so. We have some 53 organizations that have been examined by our investigators since the last hearings. Those organizations are charged with being Fascist organizations. We hope we can conclude by Thursday night.

Homer Martin will be here Wednesday morning. He did not want to testify before Wednesday.

The first witness this morning is Edgar J. Herzog.

TESTIMONY OF EDGAR J. HERZOG

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. Herzog, I want you to be comfortable. You may smoke and relax. Give us your name.

Mr. HERZOG. Edgar J. Herzog.

Mr. MOSIER. Where do you live?

Mr. HERZOG. Elyria, Ohio.

Mr. MOSIER. How long have you lived in Ohio?

Mr. HERZOG. Since the fall of 1919.

Mr. MOSIER. I believe that was approximately the date when you got out of the United States Army.

Mr. HERZOG. That is correct.

Mr. MOSIER. You were wounded in action in France.

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And as a result, your health has not been very good, I understand.

Mr. HERZOG. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. It is rather difficult for you to hear.

Mr. HERZOG. That is correct.

Mr. MOSIER. I believe, since you have been ill, you want to start your testimony here today, but would prefer to then suspend and finish your testimony at some other time.

Mr. HERZOG. That is correct.

Mr. MOSIER. I believe you have many documents and other proofs in writing as to the things you are going to testify about here today and in the future, and that you will produce them at the next hearing.

Mr. HERZOG. That is correct.

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. Herzog, are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. How long have you been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HERZOG. Since 1932.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you join the Communist Party in Ohio?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Why did you join the Communist Party?

Mr. HERZOG. I had heard a great deal of talk about the Communist Party, and I felt that the way to find out what the Communist Party was all about was to join and find out, and become acquainted with the Communist movement in Ohio.

Mr. MOSIER. You joined in 1932.

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And you have remained a member of the Communist Party from then up until now.

Mr. HERZOG. Up to the present time; yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Have you participated in Communist meetings over Ohio?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You are familiar with the leading Communists in Ohio?

Mr. HERZOG. With a majority of them; yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. I believe that in 1935 you were appointed by the American Legion to be chairman of the un-American activities committee of the American Legion in Ohio.

Mr. HERZOG. In 1937 and 1938.

Mr. MOSIER. In that work you have constantly gone around over Ohio, have you not?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And attended Communist meetings?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You have been paid for that work in 1937 and 1938, by the American Legion.

Mr. HERZOG. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You have not been paid anything for it?

Mr. HERZOG. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Going back to your war record, you were injured in France?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You received citations?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. From the French Government.

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you receive any from the American Government?

Mr. HERZOG. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You receive compensation here from the American Government.

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, Mr. Herzog, you have become familiar, have you not, with various front organizations of the Communist Party?

Mr. HERZOG. With several of them; yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you have any knowledge of the membership of the Communist Party in the State of Ohio?

Mr. HERZOG. Only through conversations with John Williamson, the State secretary.

Mr. MOSIER. John Williamson is the State secretary?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know him?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And you have talked with him?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. How many card-bearing members of the Communist Party would you say there are in the State of Ohio, approximately?

Mr. HERZOG. John Williamson claims between thirty and thirty-five thousand at the present time.

Mr. MOSIER. How does Ohio rank with the other States in the Nation in the number of card-bearing members?

Mr. HERZOG. According to Mr. Williamson, it ranks third.

Mr. MOSIER. There are two States ahead of Ohio.

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; California and New York.

Mr. MOSIER. California is first, New York second, and Ohio third.

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Have you ever secured members for the Communist Party?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you detail to the committee how you secure members for the Communist Party, and what they must do to join?

Mr. HERZOG. There are several methods employed in Ohio, mainly among the unemployed and dissatisfied, or fellows who would be out on strike, the strikes being led by Communist Party organizers who would induce them to sign up.

Mr. MOSIER. What would they have to pay when they signed up?

Mr. HERZOG. It would depend on what they had, if anything. We have signed them up for nothing, or given them cards for nothing. Some of them signed up for 5 cents or 10 cents, with the regular weekly assessments.

Mr. MOSIER. What are the weekly assessments?

Mr. HERZOG. The weekly assessments run according to the amount of money they are earning—from 2 cents to \$1 per week.

Mr. MOSIER. What are those assessments for, or where does the money go?

Mr. HERZOG. Two cents or three cents goes directly to the Communist Party in the State, and then there are special assessments and special stamps that they pay up weekly or monthly: Some of it is to aid China, some to aid Spain, and some to aid Germany. We have a special German-aid stamp and a special Spanish stamp. Then there is a special stamp to aid China.

Mr. MOSIER. Do they have anything to aid Czechoslovakia?

Mr. HERZOG. To my knowledge, they never had a contribution or anything that went to Czechoslovakia.

Mr. MOSIER. But they do make contributions to China, Loyalist Spain, and Germany?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you state to the committee the names of a number of prominent leaders of the Communist Party in Ohio, and what their duties are? Speak as loudly as you can.

Mr. HERZOG. My throat is bad because of recent sickness.

Mr. MOSIER. Any time you want to stop, tell us.

Mr. HERZOG. John Williamson is the State secretary and John Steuben is the section organizer at Youngstown, Ohio.

Mr. MOSIER. John Williamson is in charge of the State of Ohio?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Where is his office?

Mr. HERZOG. Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. MOSIER. Does the Communist Party maintain an office at Cleveland?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Where is Steuben from?

Mr. HERZOG. At Youngstown, Ohio. His nickname is "Shorty" Steuben.

Mr. MOSIER. He is at Youngstown?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; he and Robert Burke are head organizers at Youngstown, Ohio.

Mr. MOSIER. All right; go right ahead.

Mr. HERZOG. There is Thomas Keller, of Akron, Ohio.

Mr. MOSIER. Before you go to Keller, let me ask this: Were Burke and Steuben involved in the steel strike last year at Youngstown?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; they were both arrested and pleaded guilty to indictments.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, Mr. Keller is at Akron?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; James Keller. He is called Jim Keller. He is the district organizer at Akron.

Mr. MOSIER. Connected with the rubber workers or the workers in the great rubber plants at Akron?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir. The next is Phil Bart. He is a drifter, going from place to place. In other words, he is hot, and does not locate in any place.

Mr. MOSIER. What do you mean by "hot"?

Mr. HERZOG. He has a police record.

Mr. MOSIER. He is a sort of roving ambassador?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; he moves around wherever there is a disturbance.

Mr. MOSIER. Wherever there is a disturbance, Bart goes there.

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir. He was formerly from Cleveland, Ohio. The next is John Meldon, of the Cleveland district.

Mr. MOSIER. He is in the Cleveland district?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. He is under Williamson?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; all of them are under Williamson. The next is Frank Rogers.

Mr. MOSIER. Where is he located?

Mr. HERZOG. In Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. MOSIER. He is located, you say, in Cleveland, Ohio?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir. The next is Dorothy Cannon, of Toledo, Ohio. She is the Communist organizer in charge of the youth movement of the Communist Party in the State of Ohio, and of the teachers' group.

Mr. MOSIER. She handles the youth movement?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; and the Young Pioneers' movement.

Mr. MOSIER. That is a Communist front, is it not?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. I believe they publish a newspaper, do they not?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. The Young Pioneer.

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir. Dorothy Cannon writes articles for it.

Mr. MOSIER. She is in Toledo?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know anything about the newspaper, the Young Pioneer?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; she writes articles for it.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know anything about that newspaper being published and distributed here in Washington?

Mr. HERZOG. During the Boy Scout Jamboree here in Washington a year ago there were 100,000 copies of that paper distributed among the Boy Scouts attending the Jamboree.

Mr. MOSIER. Here in Washington?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. That was the Young Pioneer?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; it was distributed among the Boy Scouts attending the jamboree.

Mr. MOSIER. What else does Dorothy Cannon do? You mentioned her name in connection with teachers.

Mr. HERZOG. If any teacher who is now a member of the Communist Party feels that they have another teacher that would be willing to join up and teach communism, they have a school in Toledo, Ohio, which is called the Workers' School, where they instruct the teachers in communism, and the methods of teaching communism in the schools in the State of Ohio.

Mr. MOSIER. Where are the pupils recruited from to go to that school?

Mr. HERZOG. They are recruited from all over the State.

Mr. MOSIER. From the public schools of the State of Ohio?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir. She conducts a school at Toledo. She conducts a school for the workers or teachers who are already members of the Communist Party, or for teachers who have signified an intention of becoming members of the Communist Party. That is at Toledo. They may attend meetings in their localities. They instruct

them to make them effective teachers, giving particular attention to teachers who are nursery teachers. They become acquainted with the schools and various colleges throughout the country. They are students who have signified their intention of joining the Communist Party.

Mr. MOSIER. Who finances that work of teaching the schoolteachers? Is that financed from general dues from members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HERZOG. I have one card of a nursery teacher who is a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MOSIER. You have one card?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Who finances that school?

Mr. HERZOG. It is financed by the Young Communist League, which is an affiliate of the Communist Party.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you happen to know where that school is located in Toledo?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you care to tell?

Mr. HERZOG. I do not have the correct address here. It is in the files.

Mr. MOSIER. You have it?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; I have it in the files, available for the committee.

Mr. MOSIER. You can produce it later?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. From your experience as a member of the Communist Party in Ohio, have you any knowledge, or can you make an estimate, of how many teachers, teaching in the public schools of Ohio at the present time, are members of the Communist Party in that State?

Mr. HERZOG. Last May, at the Ohio Teachers Federation meeting held at Columbus, Ohio, the Communist slate of teachers for certain offices in the Ohio federation received approximately 400 votes.

Mr. MOSIER. Four hundred votes for their slate?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. MOSIER. Out of how many was that; do you know?

Mr. HERZOG. I could not state, because I was not present at the conference, and I have not found out how many were present.

The CHAIRMAN. But 400 votes were cast for the Communist slate?

Mr. HERZOG. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it known generally that that was a Communist slate?

Mr. HERZOG. Four hundred schoolteachers—when the delegates to the Ohio Teachers Conference registered they were handed an envelope with the program and the outline of the conference and the things that were happening in the next 2 days, and in that envelope that was handed to every teacher there was a mimeographed letter addressed from the Communist headquarters in Cleveland, Ohio, to "Dear Fellow Teachers." I have a part of that letter here.

The paper was headed: "Communist Party of Ohio, 1524 Prospect Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio," dated May 14, 1938.

FELLOW TEACHERS: The organized teachers belonging to the Communist Party of Ohio extend greetings to all delegates and visitors to the fourth annual convention of the Ohio Federation of Teachers.

That letter was signed:

We hope that the teachers assembled here will strive earnestly toward the goal, and extend our wishes for a successful meeting.

Fraternally yours,

TEACHERS BELONGING TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF OHIO.

I have a copy of that letter which I will submit to the committee at a later date.

Mr. MOSIER. That letter was circulated among the teachers who were attending that convention in May at Columbus, Ohio?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir. That letter was put into every teacher's envelope. Every teacher received that letter.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, going back, Mr. Herzog, to what we were talking about before, you have stated, I believe, that to the best of your information there are some 30,000 to 35,000 members of the Communist Party in the State of Ohio.

Mr. HERZOG. That is Mr. Williamson's statement, the secretary.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, looking at the map of the State of Ohio, what are the localities, roughly, where most of those members live?

Mr. HERZOG. Cleveland, Akron, Youngstown, Warren, Niles, Toledo, Columbus, Cincinnati—the industrial areas.

Mr. MOSIER. How about Portsmouth?

Mr. HERZOG. Portsmouth. They have quite a Communist group in Portsmouth, Ohio.

Mr. MOSIER. That is in the southern part of the State?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; that is in the southeastern part.

Mr. MOSIER. So that, all in all, the State is pretty well organized?

Mr. HERZOG. I have attended meetings in approximately 50 per cent of the counties in the State of Ohio.

Mr. MOSIER. Communist meetings?

Mr. HERZOG. Communist meetings.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, going back to Miss Cannon, over at Toledo, she handles the teachers. Have you any knowledge as to the literature they use in teaching these pupils?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What do they use?

Mr. HERZOG. They have a primer. They call it the First and Second Grade Primer.

Mr. MOSIER. That book is used in her school at Toledo?

Mr. HERZOG. That is—no; that primer is distributed to the teachers belonging to the Communist Party, and they in turn distribute it to the pupils of their classrooms.

Mr. MOSIER. Wherever they teach in the State?

Mr. HERZOG. Wherever they teach throughout the State. These primers are given to these teachers, and they are instructed to teach the pupils out of these primers.

Mr. MOSIER. So that the teachers—these 400 teachers, or whatever the number may be—have the first- and second-grade primers handed to them by the top of the party?

Mr. HERZOG. That is correct.

Mr. MOSIER. With instructions to distribute that as widely as possible among their students in the public schools?

Mr. HERZOG. That is right. Wherever they have a family, or they think they have a family, that they can instruct the children in com-

munism after school hours, they are supposed to go to that family and educate the children, so that the children in turn can educate the parents.

Mr. MOSIER. Have you a copy of that First and Second Grade Primer, Mr. Herzog?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. I believe you will furnish that to the committee later?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And will you please explain to the committee why your material is not here?

Mr. HERZOG. I gave that literature to the department commander of the American Legion about 3 weeks ago. He is a newly elected department commander, and he had never seen any literature of that nature, and he wanted to take it throughout the State when he was addressing meetings of various civic groups and use it for factual evidence that he was not talking through his hat; that he actually could show it. He is connected with Wittenberg College.

Mr. MOSIER. At Springfield?

Mr. HERZOG. At Springfield, Ohio. Quite a few college professors, and so forth, think that it is just a little "red baiting" of the American Legion, and he had to have that for bona fide evidence to show that they were actually distributing that throughout the State and that it was being printed.

Mr. MOSIER. And I believe he mailed that to you a day or so ago, but at the time you left you had not received it?

Mr. HERZOG. That is correct. I was expecting it through the mail all day yesterday.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, Mr. Herzog, let us come up to 1936 or 1937. You attended a national convention, did you not, held in Cleveland?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What was that convention?

Mr. HERZOG. Well, they change the name of their outfits so often that it is pretty hard to keep track of them. It is my recollection it was the American League for Democracy and Against War, and so forth.

Mr. MOSIER. The American League for Peace and Democracy, was it not?

Mr. HERZOG. That was it. They changed the name around every time—

Mr. MOSIER. It had formerly been the League Against War and Fascism?

Mr. HERZOG. The League Against War and Fascism.

Mr. MOSIER. And, as a Communist, you attended that convention in Cleveland?

Mr. HERZOG. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. Approximately when was that, Mr. Herzog?

Mr. HERZOG. Oh, about 2½ years ago—2 years ago.

Mr. MOSIER. About 2 years ago?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir. I have the exact dates in my other file, but they are not available.

Mr. MOSIER. That is part of the material that is in the mail?

Mr. HERZOG. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you have any official connection with that convention?

Mr. HERZOG. I was a delegate. I would rather not state what my official connection was.

Mr. MOSIER. But you did have an official connection with that convention?

Mr. HERZOG. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. And you were also a delegate to the convention?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. At that convention, the convention of the American League for Peace and Democracy, did you recognize other Communist members there?

Mr. HERZOG. The Communists that attended there had to register each day in order to get their expense money.

Mr. MOSIER. And who paid their expense money?

Mr. HERZOG. The Communist Party, for whatever State they were from.

Mr. MOSIER. Would you say that the convention was dominated by the Communist members?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Or were they in a minority?

Mr. HERZOG. The Communist Party was very much in the majority.

Mr. MOSIER. Very much in the majority?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And what were the delegates paid?

Mr. HERZOG. They were allowed \$10 a day for their expenses, hotel and meals, and so forth.

Mr. MOSIER. Were you, as a delegate, allowed \$10 a day?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Can you name any prominent members of the Communist Party who were present at that national convention?

Mr. HERZOG. About the most prominent member of the convention was the principal speaker at that time, Heywood Broun.

Mr. MOSIER. Heywood Broun was the principal speaker?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, getting up to 1937, there was a strike in the steel companies in Ohio, was there not?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. When was that strike, approximately, Mr. Herzog?

Mr. HERZOG. In the summer of 1936—or 1937.

Mr. MOSIER. The summer of 1937?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. A little over a year ago?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Where were you when the strike broke out?

Mr. HERZOG. I was in Elyria when it broke out.

Mr. MOSIER. And that was not a sit-down strike, was it?

Mr. HERZOG. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What type of strike was that?

Mr. HERZOG. I would say it was a knock-down-drag-out strike.

Mr. MOSIER. Well, there were men working in the steel companies, and they continued to work in the steel companies?

Mr. HERZOG. There were some of the men working in, and there were some not working, that went out.

Mr. MOSIER. What did you do after that strike broke out?

Mr. HERZOG. I went to Youngstown, to the Communist headquarters, on the pretext of looking for a job of some kind with the Communist Party, to assist in the strike.

Mr. MOSIER. Whom did you see down in Youngstown when you went there?

Mr. HERZOG. Johnnie Williamson.

Mr. MOSIER. John Williamson?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you have a conversation with him?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. MOSIER. What was the conversation?

Mr. HERZOG. I asked John if he could not fix me up a job somewhere during the strike. I told him I was broke and I would like to have a job, and I felt that with all the activity he ought to be able to fix me up some kind of a job during the strike.

Mr. MOSIER. And what did Williamson tell you?

Mr. HERZOG. He told me to go to Warren and see Gus Hall.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, to get the record straight, the strike involved steel companies whose plants were located at Youngstown; that is true, is it not?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And also at Warren?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And Warren is only 12 or 13 miles, is it not, from Youngstown?

Mr. HERZOG. That is correct.

Mr. MOSIER. Williamson told you to go to Warren and see Gus Hall?

Mr. HERZOG. That is correct.

Mr. MOSIER. Who was Gus Hall?

Mr. HERZOG. Gus Hall at that time was Arva Halberg.

Mr. MOSIER. Was he a Communist?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Where did he live?

Mr. HERZOG. At that time he lived in Youngstown, Ohio.

Mr. MOSIER. Had you met him as one Communist meeting another?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. I believe Halberg actually ran for public office on the Communist ticket.

Mr. HERZOG. Halberg ran for the council in Youngstown in 1935 on the Communist ticket.

Mr. MOSIER. And almost ran for Governor of Ohio this time?

Mr. HERZOG. He was the Communist candidate for Governor of Ohio for this year.

Mr. MOSIER. Until the Communists withdrew their ticket?

Mr. HERZOG. The Communists withdrew their entire ticket.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you go to Warren to see Halberg?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Where did you see him?

Mr. HERZOG. I met him on the picket line. He was on the picket line directing the pickets.

Mr. MOSIER. He was directing the pickets in that strike?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. How many people were involved in that strike in Warren, approximately?

Mr. HERZOG. You mean how many men were on strike?

Mr. MOSIER. How many men were on strike, and working in the plants?

Mr. HERZOG. I could not say that, Mr. Mosier.

Mr. MOSIER. Well, there were several thousand, were there not?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; there were thousands on both sides.

Mr. MOSIER. Thousands working in the plants and thousands doing picket duty?

Mr. HERZOG. On the outside; yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You saw Halberg on the picket line?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; I first met him on the picket line.

Mr. MOSIER. Now tell the committee if you had any conversation with him, and what it was.

Mr. HERZOG. I went over and said, "Hello, Gus," and I told him I had been to Youngstown, out of work, and wondered if he had any work for me to do; if he could not give me a job on the picket line. They were paying the Communists \$2 a day on the picket line, whether they were strikers or not, because they wanted to keep a big picket line there.

Mr. MOSIER. Were there Communists in there from other places?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Other than those in Ohio?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; Pennsylvania and Michigan.

Mr. MOSIER. Were there any from Detroit?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You were familiar with them? You knew them?

Mr. HERZOG. I knew them after we got together at headquarters and talked to one another.

Mr. MOSIER. All right. Now, you had a conversation with Halberg, and he took you on, did he?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Then what did you do?

Mr. HERZOG. Gus gave me some membership cards and told me that anybody I could sign up for the Communist Party, anything I could get for signing up fees, I could keep.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you sign anybody up?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you make any money?

Mr. HERZOG. Well, I ate; that is about all. I was not in there trying to make money. I was trying to find out things.

Mr. MOSIER. Yes. Now, did you go to their headquarters?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And where were the headquarters?

Mr. HERZOG. In an old beer garden, known as the Hollyhock Gardens.

Mr. MOSIER. That was the Communist headquarters?

Mr. HERZOG. No; that was the S. W. O. C. headquarters—the Steel Workers Organizing Committee headquarters.

Mr. MOSIER. That was the Steel Workers Organizing Committee headquarters?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Who was the top man of that headquarters?

Mr. HERZOG. Gus Hall; in absolute——

Mr. MOSIER. He was running the show, was he?

Mr. HERZOG. He was in absolute charge and control of everything. Everybody on strike took their orders from Gus.

Mr. MOSIER. Everybody on strike took their orders from this Communist?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; in the city of Warren.

Mr. MOSIER. Could anybody get through the picket line?

Mr. HERZOG. No, sir; nobody could get through the picket line.

Mr. MOSIER. Well, could Gus Hall get them through?

Mr. HERZOG. If Gus Hall gave you a pass, you could get through the picket line.

Mr. MOSIER. And how about citizens driving through the streets and around the plants? Could they do that?

Mr. HERZOG. Nobody could go down certain streets that the strikers had designated as closed streets unless Gus Hall gave them a permit to do it.

Mr. MOSIER. That is, it might be a United States highway, but you could not travel on a United States highway——

Mr. HERZOG (interposing). Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. MOSIER. Unless Gus Hall, or Halberg, gave you a pass?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir. His name was still Gus Hall at that time.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, Hall was an organizer for the S. W. O. C., which is a C. I. O. affiliate; is that right?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir. He was on a dual pay roll. He was on the Communist pay roll as a Communist organizer in the Youngstown area, and on the S. W. O. C. pay roll as a C. I. O. organizer.

Mr. MOSIER. When you went to headquarters, which you say Gus Hall reigned over as the king, or the chief factotum——

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Who else was there at headquarters?

Mr. HERZOG. Well, the dynamite squad hung out there.

Mr. MOSIER. The dynamite squad?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Tell us a little about the dynamite squad. What were they?

Mr. HERZOG. Well, that is a matter of court record in Ohio at the present time.

Mr. MOSIER. Yes; I know.

Mr. HERZOG. But they were headed by a fellow by the name of Art Scott.

Mr. MOSIER. Art Scott—S-c-o-t-t?

Mr. HERZOG. That is correct; Arthur Scott.

Mr. MOSIER. And what was their job in this strike; that is, the dynamite squad?

Mr. HERZOG. The men that were in the plant could not get out. They were confined in there for a period of several weeks, and, of course, their families were at home and were worried; and their job was to go around and intimidate the families of the men who were inside of the plant working and, if necessary, to blow the place up, which they did in several instances.

Mr. MOSIER. That is, blow houses up?

Mr. HERZOG. Houses, railroads, anything.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, what connection did Halberg or Hall have with the dynamite squad?

Mr. HERZOG. Hall directed the activity.

Mr. MOSIER. Would he tell these fellows——

Mr. HERZOG (interposing). He would tell these fellows when and where to go to do it.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you hear Hall tell them, ever?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You heard him tell them what to do?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Where did they get the dynamite?

Mr. HERZOG. The first couple of loads of dynamite they obtained in Oil City, Pa.

Mr. MOSIER. Youngstown is near the Pennsylvania line, is it not?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And they went over to Oil City?

Mr. HERZOG. They went over to Oil City.

Mr. MOSIER. Across the Pennsylvania-Ohio line?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And obtained some dynamite?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And where did they bring that dynamite?

Mr. HERZOG. They brought the dynamite back to Warren.

Mr. MOSIER. Where did they keep it?

Mr. HERZOG. They first kept it in Art Scott's home, and then they kept it in the headquarters.

Mr. MOSIER. The headquarters where you were?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And when Hall would tell them to go out and do a job, then they would go out and do the dynamiting?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Did they have anything else but dynamite there?

Mr. HERZOG. Well, Gus was not getting results with dynamite, so he told the boys to go to Oil City and bring back some nitroglycerin.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you hear him tell them that?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Did they go?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. I believe you stated to me that you gave them the money to go.

Mr. HERZOG. Art Scott went down and got two of the boys in the car, that had a car, and told them to go to Oil City and bring back some dynamite.

Mr. MOSIER. Dynamite or nitroglycerin?

Mr. HERZOG. Nitroglycerin. Gus told them to go over to Oil City and bring back the nitro. Scott came back and told us that the boys didn't have any money for gas or oil, and Gus asked me if I had any money. He knew that I had collected \$5 that day, and he asked me for \$5 to give the boys for gas and oil, and I gave him the \$5—gave it to Gus—and Gus gave it to Art Scott.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you see Scott after he returned from Oil City?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Did they have the nitroglycerin?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Where did they keep the nitroglycerin?

Mr. HERZOG. They took it over to Scotty's house.

Mr. MOSIER. They did not put that in the headquarters?

Mr. HERZOG. Not till later.

Mr. MOSIER. How long did this strike continue down there?

Mr. HERZOG. I was there 21 days, and I went there about a week after it started.

Mr. MOSIER. The strike continued approximately a month?

Mr. HERZOG. I would say approximately a month.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, during the time you were there and at headquarters, which was presided over by Gus Hall, did you see any other ammunition or arms at headquarters?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What was that, if you will tell the committee?

Mr. HERZOG. Well, there were rifles, shotguns, clubs, ball bats, pieces of pipe, pieces of old sickle tied onto clubs, and a couple of Tommy guns.

Mr. MOSIER. And who furnished those implements?

Mr. HERZOG. Gus claimed they came up from Pittsburgh. They were there when I got there.

Mr. MOSIER. I believe you testified that you saw Communists there from other parts of Ohio and Michigan. Did you see any there from Pittsburgh?

Mr. HERZOG. From Pittsburgh?

Mr. MOSIER. Yes.

Mr. HERZOG. Just Communists from Pennsylvania, and they came up from Pittsburgh.

Mr. MOSIER. I see. What was your understanding that these arms that were in there were to be used for?

Mr. HERZOG. Well, in the event that the men in the plant made any attempt to come out, or if there was any attempt made by the police departments to break the picket line.

Mr. MOSIER. Was the police department of the city of Warren making any attempt to preserve any law and order there?

Mr. HERZOG. If they were, it was not very evident.

Mr. MOSIER. Gus Hall—

Mr. HERZOG (interposing). Gus Hall conducted the law-and-order campaign.

Mr. MOSIER. Gus Hall was running the show?

Mr. HERZOG. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, as this strike went on, you were in and out of that headquarters?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You were down on the picket line?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And you were familiar with Gus Hall's operations and the operations of his group?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, coming up to the time along at the end of the strike, will you tell the committee what happened with reference to a group of citizens of Warren and vicinity who were organizing?

Mr. HERZOG. All I knew that was going on in regard to that were strikers who were attending these meetings coming back and telling Gus what was going on.

Mr. MOSIER. What would their reports be to Gus, if you can give it to us without any detail?

Mr. HERZOG. They would come back and tell us who was the chairman of the meeting, who spoke, how many attended, and what they were planning on doing.

Mr. MOSIER. What were they planning on doing?

Mr. HERZOG. They called them around headquarters the "shotgun army." That was the name the strikers gave them around there. It was the "shotgun army."

Mr. MOSIER. What was the "shotgun army?" What was their intention?

Mr. HERZOG. They came back and told us there were approximately three or four hundred people organizing a "shotgun army;" the majority of them were World War veterans; that they were coming down and going to break that picket line, break up that headquarters, that the people were getting tired of the dynamiting and intimidation going on.

Mr. MOSIER. The headquarters you refer to was where you were?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes; Hollyhock Gardens.

Mr. MOSIER. Then what happened?

Mr. HERZOG. Things got pretty bad and Gus began to get scared, and Gus decided to call for help.

Mr. MOSIER. Were you present when this happened?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir. The Mediation Board was meeting in Cleveland at that time, and Gus decided he would call them and see if we could not get some help. He called Cleveland.

Mr. MOSIER. Were you present when he called Cleveland?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know who he called in Cleveland?

Mr. HERZOG. He called Clint Golden or John Lewis.

Mr. MOSIER. They were in Cleveland at the time.

Mr. HERZOG. They were in Cleveland?

Mr. MOSIER. Golden or Lewis—he called for either one he could get?

Mr. HERZOG. He called for either one.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know where they were staying in Cleveland?

Mr. HERZOG. I think at the Hotel Cleveland.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you hear his conversation with either one of those gentlemen?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you tell the committee what happened, what you heard?

Mr. HERZOG. He told them the reports he had in regard to the "shotgun army" and said if they did not get some help or protection there was apt to be a lot of murder and that their picket lines would be broken, that we would not be able to hold off a crew that big.

Mr. MOSIER. That was the nature of the conversation?

Mr. HERZOG. That was the nature of the conversation, or words to that effect.

Mr. MOSIER. Then what happened?

Mr. HERZOG. Then they told Gus they would call him back.

Mr. MOSIER. Did they call him back?

Mr. HERZOG. They called Gus back between 4 and 5 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. MOSIER. Were you there?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you answer the telephone?

Mr. HERZOG. I answered the phone, when that call came in from Cleveland.

Mr. MOSIER. What did Helberg say they said?

Mr. HERZOG. Gus told me they had talked to Washington, that they had called Washington, and Washington had called the Governor, and the Governor would have troops in there the next day to protect them.

Mr. MOSIER. To protect the strikers?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Did the troops come in the next day?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Did they protect the strikers?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. That is, there was nobody injured after the troops got there?

Mr. HERZOG. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Either in the plant or on the picket line?

Mr. HERZOG. The "shotgun army" did not make a move and the strikers did not make a move.

Mr. MOSIER. I understand that after the troops got there, the picket line dispersed.

Mr. HERZOG. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. It stayed there?

Mr. HERZOG. The picket line was on the day the troops came in, and Gus got these strikers out, and he welcomed them.

Mr. MOSIER. He welcomed the troops at that stage of the game?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes; he was tickled to death that they came.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know whether there were any arrests made in connection with the dynamite or nitroglycerin? Were there any arrests made?

Mr. HERZOG. There were about 3 gallons of nitroglycerin in the headquarters at that time, and Gus told Art Scott to get the crew together and go down and blow out the bridge leading across to the plant.

Mr. MOSIER. What plant was this, by the way?

Mr. HERZOG. The steel plant.

Mr. MOSIER. Republic Steel.

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; he told them to blow up the bridge going into the plant, and to take another lot out and blow up the benzol plant.

Mr. MOSIER. What was the benzol plant?

Mr. HERZOG. One of the byproduct plants of the coke plant. They had approximately a quarter of a million gallons of volatile benzol. Gus gave them orders to go out and blow up the benzol plant.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you hear that?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Were you present?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. He told another crew to go out and blow up the bridge?

Mr. HERZOG. To get the bridge.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know what happened?

Mr. HERZOG. I walked down and tipped off one of the National Guardsmen.

Mr. MOSIER. That was after the National Guard got down there?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir. I told one of the National Guardsmen to get in touch with the commanding officer and be on the lookout for the Buick and the Plymouth carrying the nitroglycerin around.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you have the license tag numbers of the Buick and the Plymouth?

Mr. HERZOG. I just had them in my memory.

Mr. MOSIER. At that time you knew them?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You told them to be on the lookout for a particular Buick and a particular Plymouth automobile?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir. Then I rejoined Gus and the rest of the crew.

Mr. MOSIER. Did they blow up the bridge?

Mr. HERZOG. The National Guardsmen halted them on their way over with the nitroglycerin in their car, and as soon as we got word that they had been arrested—they arrested these men—Gus blew out of town and I blew out.

Mr. MOSIER. You left town?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was Golden's name?

Mr. HERZOG. Clint S. Golden; Clint Golden, Gus called him.

The CHAIRMAN. That is "G-o-l-d-e-n"?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes; it is "G-o-l-d-e-n."

The CHAIRMAN. He put in a call and told the operator he wanted either Clint Golden—

Mr. HERZOG. Clint Golden or John L. Lewis.

The CHAIRMAN. He got somebody in Cleveland?

Mr. HERZOG. He got somebody in Cleveland.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know which one he got?

Mr. HERZOG. No, sir; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. You heard his conversation?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And then after that they called him back later on?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you there when they called him back?

Mr. HERZOG. I answered the phone.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know who called him back?

Mr. HERZOG. No, sir; the operator says, "Cleveland calling Gus Helberg."

Mr. MOSIER. You were sleeping in headquarters all the time?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. While you were there at headquarters, did you observe anything in connection with the United States mail?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you tell the committee what that was?

Mr. HERZOG. The men in the plant wanted their laundry and clothing; they could not get out to get it.

Mr. MOSIER. They could not get out of the plant because of the picket line?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; the pickets would not let anybody in or out.

Mr. MOSIER. They were there for about 30 days?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; that is correct. The men had conceived the idea of writing to their families and asking their families to send the stuff in the parcel post. Then their families wrapped it up and took it to the post office for delivery by parcel post.

Mr. MOSIER. Were you ever present at the post office to see any of that?

Mr. HERZOG. I went down to the post office with Gus.

Mr. MOSIER. With Gus Hall?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you tell the committee what happened after you got there?

Mr. HERZOG. Gus went into the post office and kicked the packages around and saw how they were addressed and where they were addressed and told the postmaster that, by God, they had better not deliver any packages inside the mill addressed to the seabs inside of the plant.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know whether the postmaster observed his warning?

Mr. HERZOG. The postmaster, as far as I know, attempted to send one truck load of stuff into the plant.

Mr. MOSIER. What happened to that?

Mr. HERZOG. The truck was overturned and the contents were kicked around the street.

Mr. MOSIER. Who overturned the truck?

Mr. HERZOG. The boys on the picket line.

Mr. MOSIER. A United States mail truck?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Those men on the picket line overturned the truck and the contents went into the street?

Mr. HERZOG. That is correct.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know what happened to the contents?

Mr. HERZOG. No; I do not know; I was not present when the truck was overturned; I was in the Hollyhock Gardens when the boys came up and said they had done it.

The CHAIRMAN. We will take a recess until 2 o'clock.

(Thereupon, the committee took a recess until 2 p. m. this day.)

AFTER RECESS

The subcommittee reassembled pursuant to taking a recess at 2 p. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. Herzog, this morning we asked you to give us the names of some of the Communist leaders in Ohio, and you named the director for the State and for Youngstown and Akron, and you got over to Toledo. Are there any others that you have not named?

TESTIMONY OF EDGAR HERZOG—Resumed

Mr. HERZOG. I do not think I gave you the name of T. Louis Majors, formerly of New Castle, Pa. He was the head of the Chenango Valley Lodge of the C. I. O., and that lodge expelled him from membership for his Communist activities in Pennsylvania. He turned up in Middletown, Ohio, as an organizer for the C. I. O. in Middletown, Ohio.

Mr. MOSIER. That is the place in Ohio where they just had a strike?

Mr. HERZOG. The strike was just settled in the past day or so, but not where Mr. Majors was conducting a strike.

Mr. MOSIER. Go right ahead.

Mr. HERZOG. I have at this time a couple of letters here that I could give the committee, one that was issued by the Communist Party of the State of Ohio, of Hamilton County and Butler County, condemning the American Legion for the action we took in regard to Mr. Majors. The other letter is a letter that the American Legion issued to the people of Middletown. I can read them for the record if you care to have them.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you let me see those letters?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir [handing letters to Mr. Mosier].

This letter [indicating] was mailed to every citizen in Middletown whose mailing address we had.

Mr. MOSIER. I understand that T. Louis Majors was in Middletown ostensibly as a labor organizer?

Mr. HERZOG. He was there as a C. I. O. organizer.

Mr. MOSIER. And this letter which was sent out by the Middletown Post 218 of the American Legion was a letter designed to acquaint the citizens of Middletown with the fact that he was really a Communist?

Mr. HERZOG. Correct.

Mr. MOSIER. And that the people of Middletown should know that.

Mr. HERZOG. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Herzog, how many Communists do you know of who are serving or who have served as organizers for the C. I. O. in Ohio?

Mr. HERZOG. The ones I am positive of are Gus Hall, Robert Burke, Shorty Steuben, John Stenben, and T. Louis Majors.

Those fellows were on the pay roll of the Communist Party at the same time they were on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C.

The CHAIRMAN. What about Mr. Keller, in Akron?

Mr. HERZOG. And Jim Keller, of Akron.

The CHAIRMAN. He was a well-known Communist and also an organizer for the S. W. O. C.?

Mr. HERZOG. They acted in the capacity of organizers and negotiated for contracts with various manufacturers throughout that locality.

Mr. MOSIER. But Keller was in the rubber situation, was he not?

Mr. HERZOG. Jim Keller was in the rubber situation.

Mr. MOSIER. He was not in the steel situation?

Mr. HERZOG. No; he was in the rubber situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about the Workers' Alliance?

Mr. HERZOG. I only had one contact with the Workers' Alliance, and that was in Akron, Ohio. The exact dates I have not got in this file. I can give them to you at a later date.

When a group of Communists at the Goodyear Tire & Rubber refused to allow the afternoon shift to come to work—Jim Keller went down and brought a bunch of the P. W. A. workers off of the job—they quit at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, to form a picket line to prevent the afternoon shift going to work.

The CHAIRMAN. They were W. P. A. workers who were members of the Workers' Alliance?

Mr. HERZOG. It was called the Communist group in that community.

The CHAIRMAN. They were brought there after their work on the W. P. A. project was finished for the day?

Mr. HERZOG. After they were through their W. P. A. job, to picket the Goodyear Tire & Rubber, to prevent the afternoon shift going to work.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you know that to be a fact?

Mr. HERZOG. When the police shot the gas at them—if you will take the hospital records, you will find the names of the ones in the hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you there at the time?

Mr. HERZOG. I got burned in the hand with a little of it.

The CHAIRMAN. When you say "P. W. A." workers you mean W. P. A. workers, do you not?

Mr. HERZOG. W. P. A. or P. W. A.—I have lost track of the alphabet. I know they were on some Federal project in that community.

The CHAIRMAN. Under Hopkins, or under Ickes, do you know? What kind of work were they doing?

Mr. HERZOG. You could verify that by taking the hospital records or the police records in Akron; they will show you where their place of employment was. About 30 of them, I think, were taken to the hospital at that time.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you recall when that was?

Mr. HERZOG. That was about 10 weeks ago.

Mr. MOSIER. You were down there in that situation as a Communist?

Mr. HERZOG. One of the contacts that I saw there told me they were going down, and I came down just about the time it was happening.

The CHAIRMAN. You told us something about the Young Communist League, or the Pioneers. Do you have the pledge they have to take?

Mr. HERZOG. I do not hear you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have the pledge they have to take when they come into the Young Communist League?

Mr. HERZOG. The pledge of the Young Communist League—

The CHAIRMAN. Read it to us.

Mr. HERZOG. It was the "ten commandments."

The CHAIRMAN. Is that what they call it?

Mr. HERZOG. The ten commandments of the Young Communist League.

This is it:

1. The life of a young Communist is devoted to the fight for the emancipation of the working class from capitalist slavery. He must consider participation in this fight and the winning of new fellow fighters as his highest duty.

2. Every member of the Young Communist League must strive at all times to deepen his understanding of the political, economic, and social conditions and to broaden his knowledge of Communism.

3. Every member must take part in all the activities of his unit and of the respective local bodies to which he belongs. Punctuality, attentiveness, and active participation in discussion is the duty of everyone. Every young Communist must be a member of his trade union and work everywhere for the organization of the unorganized young workers into fighting unions.

4. Every young Communist must attentively read and study the Young Worker in order to be informed of all league tasks. Everyone must become a contributor to the league papers.

5. Every member must work to become an active functionary and to further the work of the league by his self-activity.

6. Every young Communist must be an agitator wherever he meets young workers, especially in shops, trade unions, the armed forces, and sports organizations.

7. It is the duty of every member to work for the building up of Young Communist League fraction or form one in trade unions, workers' sports clubs, schools, etc., to which he belongs.

8. A young Communist must at once bring to the knowledge of the leading body of the organization any important social, economic, and political occurrences which he may observe.

9. The members of the Young Communist League must act as one in outside organizations and against the enemy. Criticism and differences within their own ranks must under no circumstances take place there.

10. In case of arrest a Young Communist League member must not give any testimony to the police which could be used against other comrades, even if the police tell him that other comrades have already testified. A young Communist does not allow either police tricks or force to make him a traitor to his class comrades and his organization.

The CHAIRMAN. You told us something about a workers' school in Toledo. Is that the only town in Ohio where the Communists have workers' schools?

Mr. HERZOG. They have workers' schools in Cleveland, Toledo, and Cincinnati, Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. Toledo, Ohio, and what other towns?

Mr. HERZOG. Toledo, Cincinnati, and Cleveland.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been in those workers' schools?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us about how they are conducted?

Mr. HERZOG. They are usually conducted by someone who is a graduate of the Brookwood Labor College, in Brooklyn, N. Y. That is the labor college of the Communist Party, and the schools are conducted by someone who graduated there.

They have a course of training there. They take the labor leaders and they give them instructions in the conducting of strikes, in regard to police headquarters, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. What do they teach them? You say they teach them how to conduct themselves in strikes?

Mr. HERZOG. How to conduct a strike and sabotage.

For instance, if a man is working in a shop where they have intricate machinery and they are going to call a strike, and they think the factory is going to work, they teach a man the most efficient way to damage the machinery before he goes out on strike. They know the vital spots of the shop before they leave.

The CHAIRMAN. What do they teach them to do when they are arrested?

Mr. HERZOG. The first thing they teach them to do is to call some one from the I. L. D.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that?

Mr. HERZOG. They are told to call some one in the locality in the I. L. D., or the Civil Liberties Union.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the International Labor Defense and the Civil Liberties Union?

Mr. HERZOG. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the first thing they are told to do when they are arrested.

Mr. HERZOG. That is the first thing they are supposed to do. The legal department is headed by Yetta Land and her son, and a fellow by the name of Onda.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know who heads the Civil Liberties Union in Ohio?

Mr. HERZOG. I can give it to you. In Ohio they have two branches. At Cincinnati there is the Civil Liberties Committee at 147 Mason Street. Dr. George A. Hetger is chairman and May Bright is secretary. In Cleveland their office is 1013 Society for Savings Building; Rev. John Sommerlatte is chairman and Harry I. Dworkin is secretary, and George Palda is counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. So that when they are arrested, the workers' schools teach them to contact either the officers of the Civil Liberties Union or of the I. L. D.?

Mr. HERZOG. The only arrests that I was familiar with during the "Little Steel" strike were, of course, the arrests that were made in Warren. My understanding from Gus was—and it was later borne out—that an attorney by the name of Lee Pressman, who is the legal counsel for the C. I. O., represented him.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about the American Youth Congress?

Mr. HERZOG. The American Youth movement?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the youth movement.

Mr. HERZOG. In Ohio, that is all tied up with Dorothy Cannon and J. Herman, of Toledo.

The CHAIRMAN. Dorothy Cannon and who else?

Mr. HERZOG. Dorothy Cannon and J. Herman. J. Herman is in charge of—he is the district organizer, and Dorothy Cannon has charge of the youth and the girl movement and the school-teacher movement. J. Herman has charge of the young boys' group.

The CHAIRMAN. They are both well-known Communists, are they?

Mr. HERZOG. Well, they operate along the lines of making light of the Boy Scout movement. They have a lot of literature which, unfortunately, I have not got with me.

The CHAIRMAN. What I am after is this: Dorothy Cannon and Herman are the dominating figures in the Youth movement?

Mr. HERZOG. That is right; in Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. In Ohio?

Mr. HERZOG. In Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they well-known Communists?

Mr. HERZOG. Oh, yes; they admit they are Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. So that with respect to Communist leadership in the Youth Congress in Ohio, what are the facts?

Mr. HERZOG. They make no secret of the fact that they are the leaders of—

The CHAIRMAN. Of the whole movement?

Mr. HERZOG. Of the whole movement in Ohio. They work directly under Johnnie Williamson.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is all.

Mr. MOSIER. I want to ask you just one question. Mr. Herzog, do you happen to know where the school is located in Cleveland, or do they change the location so frequently that you could not tell?

Mr. HERZOG. No; they have been pretty much in the same place right along. I think I may be able to give you the addresses from this [referring to book].

Mr. MOSIER. Never mind now, Mr. Herzog. Do you remember the street?

Mr. HERZOG. In Cleveland it is Prospect Avenue.

Mr. MOSIER. Prospect Avenue; but you do not remember the number?

Mr. HERZOG. In Cincinnati it is Elm Street. I would not say now what street it is in Toledo. They have moved there several times.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all, Mr. Herzog.

Mr. HERZOG. Mr. Dies, before I leave, there is something else that has not been brought out here that I would like to bring out. That is the insurance division of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. The insurance division?

Mr. HERZOG. They have, under a different name, an insurance division, where they sell insurance to their members. It is known as the International Workers' Order, the I. W. O., and Max Bedecht is the head of it and George Powers is the vice president.

The CHAIRMAN. Bedecht is the president and Powers is the vice president?

Mr. HERZOG. Bedecht is the secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. He is the secretary?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes. There was a case in my home town of two boys. One was the president and one was the secretary of the I. W. O., Paul Hamus, Jr., and Dominik Stevko, who applied for citizenship. The American Legion entered a complaint to the court and introduced evidence to the court that these men were members of the I. W. O. and had already taken the obligation of a Communist which necessitated the overthrow of this form of government, and we felt they were not entitled to citizenship. The court agreed and denied citizenship. Yetta Land and her son filed an appeal. I have got a certified copy of that journal entry of the appellate court decision, if you want to have it.

Mr. MOSIER. The court of appeals affirmed the lower court?

Mr. HERZOG. The court of appeals affirmed the lower court's decision.

Mr. MOSIER. And refused citizenship?

Mr. HERZOG. And Yetta Land said she would carry it to the Supreme Court, but the expiration date is past and she has not done it and I do not think she ever will.

There was a letter sent out by the I. W. O. criticizing the judge for it, which we have here, if you would care to have that. They are photostatic copies of that letter.

Mr. MOSIER. When you get your material, you are willing to come back again and testify?

Mr. HERZOG. Yes, sir; any time.

The CHAIRMAN. I have one more question I would like to ask. Have you heard of a recent order issued by the Communists to check all the lists of members to find out who is there under his bona fide name and the others?

Mr. HERZOG. That is not a recent order. That order has been in effect for years. They are always trying to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. They have not been successful?

Mr. HERZOG. They will not transfer membership from one district to another without some verification.

The CHAIRMAN. Most of the members are there under assumed names, are they not?

Mr. HERZOG. No; I would say most of the members are there under their proper name; a few like myself are in there under almost any name.

The CHAIRMAN. You have your option—or do you have any option about that?

Mr. HERZOG. They never ask the question. They just ask you your name and you give it to them and they do not ask you whether it is an alias or not. Whether they assume it is or not, I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

TESTIMONY OF LESTER J. ABELE

(The witness was duly sworn.)

Mr. MOSIER. Your name, please?

Mr. ABELE. Lester J. Abele.

Mr. MOSIER. Where do you live, Mr. Abele?

Mr. ABELE. 3265 Daleford Road, Shaker Heights, Cleveland.

Mr. MOSIER. And what is your business?

Mr. ABELE. Attorney at law, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You are a veteran of the great war?

Mr. ABELE. I am, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. I believe you are a former speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. A Republican?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And you are connected with the National Guard in Ohio?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. In what capacity?

Mr. ABELE. I am adjutant of the Seventy-third Brigade.

Mr. MOSIER. Directing your attention to June of 1937, I will ask you if at that time you received any orders, and if so what they were, in connection with your duties as an officer of the National Guard in Ohio?

Mr. ABELE. About midnight of June 21, 1937, I was called by my superior officer, Brig. Gen. L. S. Connelly, and informed that the Seventy-third Brigade had been called into service by the Governor of the State, Gov. Martin L. Davey; and that he wanted me immediately to go to Warren with him.

Mr. MOSIER. To go to Warren?

Mr. ABELE. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. And Warren is located how far from Cleveland, approximately?

Mr. ABELE. I would say about 70 miles.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you go down to Warren that night?

Mr. ABELE. I did, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. How large a city is Warren?

Mr. ABELE. About 40,000.

Mr. MOSIER. What did you find when you got to Warren?

Mr. ABELE. We found a very serious situation obtaining there.

Mr. MOSIER. Was there a strike on?

Mr. ABELE. There was a strike on at the Republic Steel Corporation and the Trumbull Cliffs Steel Co. which, I believe, was an affiliate.

Mr. MOSIER. Go right ahead; what did you find, what did you see there?

Mr. ABELE. Well, the guardsmen arrived in those cities of Warren and Youngstown, which are separated by about 12 miles, there being the plants of the Republic Steel Corporation, the Trumbull Cliffs Iron Co. and the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. in Warren, Niles, and Youngstown. Guardsmen arrived in these cities at a time when tension in the steel strike was near the breaking point, on the morning of the 22d day of June 1937.

Mr. MOSIER. Had there been any court action taken before you arrived?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir; there had been an injunction issued by Judge Lynn Griffith, judge of the court of common pleas of Trumbull County, of which Warren and Niles are cities, against the Steel Workers' organizing committee because of their activity in connection with the steel strike.

Mr. MOSIER. Was that injunction being observed?

Mr. ABELE. No, sir; it was being violated in open defiance of the injunction.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you see pickets around the plants?

Mr. ABELE. Very many of them; yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you tell the committee whether they were armed in any way?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir; they were armed with guns, clubs, iron pipes, steel rods, baseball bats, blackjacks, and other weapons.

Mr. MOSIER. As I understand it, they were preventing anyone from going into the plants or coming out of the plants; is that so?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir; preventing ingress and egress into and from the plant.

Mr. MOSIER. Just go ahead and tell the committee what else you found there with respect to the general situation surrounding this strike as an officer of the National Guard.

Mr. ABELE. We found that the local residents were apprehensive that very serious trouble might occur, and the situation, in the minds of the citizens, seemed to be that the situation had gotten beyond the control of the local police officers. The troops arrived there, as I say, on the morning of the 22d of June, and almost immediately the tension seemed to be considerably relieved. There was scheduled a march on the plant that morning by a large group known as the minute men, or vigilantes, composed of citizenry of Warren, and it was fully expected by all concerned, including the citizens of the town or of the city, that widespread bloodshed would occur as a result of it. The arrival of the troops stopped that.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you talk with any of the citizens of Warren as to their feeling about the troops coming in there? Were they satisfied with it or not satisfied?

Mr. ABELE. After the situation had cleared up considerably, within 10 days, I would say the people of Warren were very, very happy over the fact that troops had been sent there by the Governor. They felt that bloodshed had been averted.

Mr. MOSIER. Was there any bloodshed, or anything like that—any trouble in connection with the troops coming in there?

Mr. ABELE. Was there any, did you say?

Mr. MOSIER. Yes.

Mr. ABELE. No; there was not.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you hear anything about a man by the name of Gus Hall or Gus Halberg when you were there in your capacity as captain of the National Guard?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you tell the committee what that was?

Mr. ABELE. In connection with my duties as adjutant, I accompanied Brig. Gen. L. S. Conelly, who was in command of troops, to the C. I. O. headquarters, which were located in the Hollyhock Gardens, and in our efforts to be of assistance to the local police officers, and to iron out, if possible, any difficulties that had arisen, we had occasion to talk with the strike committee. The strike committee was headed up by Gus Hall and their headquarters were on the second floor of what is known as the Hollyhock Gardens in Warren.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you have any occasion to search the premises of the Hollyhock Gardens?

Mr. ABELE. I did not personally; no, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Was it done under your orders?

Mr. ABELE. The search was not done under my orders, but a search was made; yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you see anything that they found?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What was that?

Mr. ABELE. Several samples of home-made bombs, of which the base was nitroglycerin.

Mr. MOSIER. How were these bombs made up?

Mr. ABELE. The bombs had been made by filling empty whisky bottles, medicine bottles, and various other shapes and types of bottles, frequently even mason jars, with nitroglycerin, corking them or sealing them in some way, and then lengths of fuse, approximately 1 foot in length, and capped with dynamite caps and taped with friction tape around these bottles filled with nitroglycerin. They made, I might say, a very effective bomb.

Mr. MOSIER. You say you saw these bombs. Captain, that were taken out of the headquarters?

Mr. ABELE. I saw some of them that had been taken out; yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you talk with Gus Hall?

Mr. ABELE. I was present during conversations held with him. I do not recall ever having specifically spoken with him myself, although I participated in the conversations.

Mr. MOSIER. Subsequent to that time were there any arrests made in connection with bombings?

Mr. ABELE. There were.

Mr. MOSIER. During this strike?

Mr. ABELE. There were.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you tell the committee about that?

Mr. ABELE. About 3 days following the arrival of the troops in Warren a fresh wave of terrorism swept over the city as a series of night bombings began.

Mr. MOSIER. What was bombed, Captain?

Mr. ABELE. The homes of workers in the plants; railroad tracks; bridges leading to the Republic Steel plants.

The inability of the local law enforcement agencies there to solve the situation caused General Connelly to relieve me of my duties as adjutant and provost marshal and he detailed me to work in conjunction with the city solicitor of Warren in attempting to solve these bombings. A number of suspects had been taken in by the local police force with the aid of some of our troops, and after many long hours of questioning, three confessions were obtained from men who had been taken in as suspects, which solved the nitroglycerin bombings.

Mr. MOSIER. Whose confessions were obtained?

Mr. ABELE. We obtained the confession of one Arthur Scott; John Borawiec, known as Johnny the Greek; and George Bundas.

Mr. MOSIER. Can you tell the committee the gist of the confessions? I understand, Captain, you have the confessions available for this committee if we want them in the record?

Mr. ABELE. Yes. I have copies of all three of those confessions here.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you give the committee the gist of those confessions? You were present, were you, when the confessions were made?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir; I participated in the questioning. The gist of the confessions was this, that Gus Hall was the leader of the group who obtained, or sent for and obtained, dynamite and nitroglycerin, from some spot in the wooded regions outside of Oil City, Pa.; that this nitroglycerin was ordered by Hall and taken when it was brought back into Warren and eventually into the headquarters of the C. I. O., in the Hollyhock Gardens; that members of the bombing squad were designated by Hall on certain specific, definite missions, to go out and blow up certain spots in and around Warren, and those consisted of—

Mr. MOSIER (interposing). Did these confessions contain any reference to how the nitroglycerin was put into bottles?

Mr. ABELE. Oh, yes; very detailed description of how that was all done and where it was done and who participated in it.

Mr. MOSIER. But these three men all participated in it under the orders of Hall?

Mr. ABELE. That is right, sir, including others. The orders of Gus Hall, according to these confessions, were to blow up and destroy the property of the Republic Steel Corporation; homes of non-striking workers; railroad property, including tracks and bridges. They were to blow up the huge tanks, holding perhaps a quarter of a million gallons of highly volatile benzol over the property of the Republic Steel Corporation. They were to blow up the municipal electric light plant in Warren.

They were to destroy the power transformers near the steel plant.

The Meander Dam, a large fresh water reservoir furnishing water to Warren and the surrounding towns, was to have been blown up. And there were plans to fly over the steel plant shops in an airplane and drop bombs in the shops and the plant.

The confession also included a statement that C. I. O. headquarters in Warren housed an arsenal including nitroglycerin, dynamite by the case, and machine guns.

Mr. MOSIER. When you obtained these confessions, what was done? These men had been arrested previously?

Mr. ABELE. These men, along with four others whom their confessions implicated, were bound over to the grand jury of Trumbull on bonds of \$25,000 each, which they were unable to make at the time. Later the bonds were reduced from \$25,000 to \$10,000 each and bonds were furnished by the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee.

Mr. MOSIER. Was Gus Hall one of those who—

Mr. ABELE (interposing). Gus Hall was one of those against whom a warrant had been sworn, but during the taking of the confessions of Scott, Borawiec, and Bundas, Hall disappeared from Warren and was unable to be located and remained at liberty until, I believe, about the 1st of July, when he was apprehended.

Mr. MOSIER. Were those men indicted?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Indicted by the grand jury?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Was Hall indicted?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What were the indictments for, or what were the charges?

Mr. ABELE. They were indicted on the charge of illegal possession and use of explosives—all eight of them.

Mr. MOSIER. What happened to their cases?

Mr. ABELE. At their arraignment before the criminal branch of the court of common pleas they plead guilty.

Mr. MOSIER. Hall did not plead guilty?

Mr. ABELE. Seven of them, exclusive of Hall, because he had not at that time been apprehended. Subsequently, upon his apprehension—

Mr. MOSIER (interposing). What happened to the seven?

Mr. ABELE. The seven, on advice of counsel, changed their plea of not guilty to guilty. Three of them were given sentences to the penitentiary, for from 1 to 20 years, on the charge to which they plead guilty, the illegal possession and use of explosives. Four of the seven were paroled because of their extreme youth.

The CHAIRMAN. That makes eight.

Mr. ABELE. I beg pardon—four were sentenced to the penitentiary and three were paroled.

Mr. MOSIER. What happened to Hall?

Mr. ABELE. Hall, upon his apprehension, also pleaded not guilty to the charge.

Mr. MOSIER. Was he represented by counsel?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Who was his counsel?

Mr. ABELE. He was represented by a number of different attorneys, included among which were Roland Hahn, of Warren; Attorney Lovelle, of Warren; Edward Lamb, of Toledo, and an attorney by the name of Kovner, of Washington, and former Judge Townsend, of West Virginia. I believe there were other counsel, but those were the only ones I can now recall.

Mr. MOSIER. Go right ahead and trace the cases through, and state what happened to them.

Mr. ABELE. I think Gus Hall was apprehended approximately the 1st of July 1937, but this case did not come up for trial until January, I think, in 1938. It was postponed from time to time for various reasons, on request, due to illness of counsel, inability of counsel to be present, and what-not. In January of this year, the counsel then representing him filed affidavits of prejudice against the judges of Trumbull County.

Mr. MOSIER. Who was that counsel?

Mr. ABELE. I do not recall at this time.

Mr. MOSIER. All right.

Mr. ABELE. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Ohio granted a change of venue, and assigned Judge Cope—I believe I can get his exact name. It was Judge Frank F. Cope, of Carrollton, Carroll County, Ohio, who was assigned to hear the case.

Mr. MOSIER. All right.

Mr. ABELE. Judge Cope was to have appeared at Warren, I believe, around the 20th or 25th of January to hear the case. A day or two preceding that date counsel for Hall, accompanied by the county prosecutor of Trumbull County, appeared before Judge Cope.

Mr. MOSIER. Where?

Mr. ABELE. At Carrollton.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know who the counsel was then?

Mr. ABELE. No, sir; I do not. The county prosecutor told the court that he did not believe he had a case against Gus Hall, and recommended that the court accept a plea to malicious destruction of property, a much less charge, and which was a misdemeanor, and would only involve a fine. It was stated that if the court would accept a plea to that charge Hall would agree to pay a fine of \$500. That was in January 1938.

Mr. MOSIER. And the court made that entry.

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir; the court made that entry, changing the plea of not guilty.

Mr. MOSIER. Changing the charge to a lesser offense, to which he pleaded guilty?

Mr. ABELE. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. Did the prosecutor have in his possession, or available to him, at that time, the confessions of those men who were in the Ohio Penitentiary?

Mr. ABELE. I personally saw to it that he was furnished with copies of the confessions of the men in the Ohio penitentiary at that time. I furthermore was in touch with Prosecutor Reagen on two occasions between July 1, 1937, and the middle of January 1938, and offered him the testimony of three National Guard captains, who were present at the taking of those confessions; the testimony of railroad detectives who were also present at the taking of the testimony and confessions; the testimony of several local police officers of Warren who were also present at the time, and the testimony of the, I believe, seven enlisted men, who were present and saw the hurling of bombs from the fleeing automobile which was being pursued by one of our scout cars; also, the testimony of one of our engineer officers who, under the instructions of my chief, General Conery, caused the detonation of such nitroglycerine, as we were able to recover unexploded.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the name of the prosecutor?

Mr. ABELE. Paul J. Reagen.

Mr. MOSIER. Did Hall pay the fine?

Mr. ABELE. That is a little bit difficult question for me to answer.

Mr. MOSIER. Was the fine paid?

Mr. ABELE. The fine was paid.

Mr. MOSIER. The fine was paid by whom?

Mr. ABELE. I personally checked up on this before I left Cleveland to make sure. I find that the records of the clerk's office of Trumbull County, Ohio, show that a fine of \$500 was paid on June 25, 1938, 6 months after the plea of guilty was accepted. It was paid by a check drawn on the Steel Workers Organizing Committee of the Committee for Industrial Organization.

Mr. MOSIER. That is the C. I. O.

Mr. ABELE. A C. I. O. affiliate, yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you have a copy of that check?

Mr. ABELE. No, sir; I do not have a copy of that check.

Mr. MOSIER. Is there a copy of the check, or a photostatic copy of the check in existence anywhere?

Mr. ABELE. Not to my knowledge; no, sir. I do, however, have a photostatic copy of a pay check to Art Scott, one of the men whom I stated a moment ago made a confession.

Mr. MOSIER. And who is now in the Ohio Penitentiary.

Mr. ABELE. So far as I know, he is still in the Ohio Penitentiary.

Mr. MOSIER. What pay check do you have to Scott?

Mr. ABELE. The pay check is drawn by the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee, of the Committee for Industrial Organization, payable to the order of Art Scott, in the amount of \$44.50, and on the voucher attached thereto it purports to be for payment of salary for the last half of May, having had social security in the amount of 45 cents deducted therefrom. The check is dated June 23, 1937, and it was on Mr. Scott's person at the time he was apprehended in connection with the bombing.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you offer that in evidence?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir. I have also in connection with it the endorsement on the back by Art Scott, and Mrs. A. C. Scott.

(Said matter referred to was introduced in evidence and marked "Abele Exhibit No. 1, November 4, 1938.")

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know that it has been testified here that Hall was a well-known Communist from Youngstown? In your investigation, did you, as an official of the National Guard of Ohio, check on that matter?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What did you find?

Mr. ABELE. I found, that, according to the published reports and conversations with people in Warren and Youngstown, Hall under the name of Arva G. Halberg had been a defeated candidate for City Counsel of Youngstown from the fourth ward of that city on the Communist ticket in 1935; that he was also secretary to Joe Dallett, the Communist candidate for Congress from that district in the 1936 election. It appeared to be a matter of common knowledge about Warren and Youngstown that he was very definitely associated with the Communist movement.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know anything about, or did your investigation disclose anything about Scott, as to whether, or not, he was a Communist?

Mr. ABELE. No, sir; only by inference that he was a lieutenant of Gus Hall and had been following Gus Hall's orders in connection with the bombings.

Mr. MOSIER. You do not have any other evidence than that?

Mr. ABELE. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. So the sum total of this whole situation you found down there, with which you were officially connected, and as it was developed later, is that four of those men are in the Ohio Penitentiary serving from 1 to 20 years?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Three were paroled because of their youth, but the Communist leader, or Hall, was allowed to go with a \$500 fine, which was paid by the C. I. O. by check?

Mr. ABELE. Yes, sir; despite the fact that those other men, Hall being the brains of plot, were serving time in the penitentiary.

If the committee is interested, I have the Bertillon pictures of the Warren police department of Borawaic, Bundas, and Scott.

Mr. MOSIER. I do not believe we need to encumber the record with that. I think we have gone far enough.

The CHAIRMAN. We will recess until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

(Thereupon the subcommittee took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, November 5, 1938, at 10 a. m.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1938

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

Present also: Mr. Mosier.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Metcalfe, will you take the stand?

TESTIMONY OF JOHN C. METCALFE—Resumed

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Metcalfe, and make your preliminary statement before we put these witnesses on.

Mr. METCALFE. The attention of this committee was called to conditions existing in the Milwaukee area with reference to the activities of the German-American Bund. In this area, as has been pointed out in previous hearings, the leader of the German-American Bund is also the leader for the Middle West area of the German-American Bund, and his name is George Froboese.

In the Milwaukee area is also a Silver Shirts organization and another organization known as the Protective League of Milwaukee. The detailed activities of these groups, along with a group known as the German-American Alliance, have created no end of difficulties in Milwaukee, and their activities in turn have caused a number of citizens of Milwaukee to write to this committee asking us to come down there and investigate this situation.

An example, for instance, is found in a newspaper story of October 31—last Monday—in which the German-American Alliance held a meeting at the auditorium, and 2,000 people protested the gathering because of its Nazi character. Twenty-four arrests were made. We have witnesses here today that can tell the detailed story of not only this particular riot, but other riots in previous months, which have come about as a result of these Nazi activities in Milwaukee. When they have completed, Mr. Chairman, I would like to amplify their remarks with certain documentary evidence which we have obtained in addition to the material which they will present to this committee.

(The paper referred to was marked "John C. Metcalfe Exhibit No. 1, November 5, 1938.")

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hofmann, will you take the stand, please?

TESTIMONY OF BERNHARD HOFMANN

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Your name is Bernhard Hofmann?

Mr. HOFMANN. Correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you live, Mr. Hofmann?

Mr. HOFMANN. In Milwaukee.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you lived in Milwaukee?

Mr. HOFMANN. Almost 16 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a native-born American citizen?

Mr. HOFMANN. No; German-born.

The CHAIRMAN. You are German born?

Mr. HOFMANN. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. But a naturalized citizen of the United States?

Mr. HOFMANN. Correct.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you come to the United States?

Mr. HOFMANN. In 1923.

The CHAIRMAN. From what portion of Germany did you come?

Mr. HOFMANN. The northern part of Germany, not far from Hamburg.

The CHAIRMAN. What business are you engaged in in Milwaukee?

Mr. HOFMANN. Salesman.

The CHAIRMAN. For what? For what outfit?

Mr. HOFMANN. For the radio.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you hold any position in the Wisconsin Federation of German-American Societies?

Mr. HOFMANN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that position?

Mr. HOFMANN. State chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. State chairman or president; which is the name?

Mr. HOFMANN. President.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a State organization?

Mr. HOFMANN. That is a State organization.

The CHAIRMAN. It is also affiliated with the national organization, is it not?

Mr. HOFMANN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not?

Mr. HOFMANN. It is not.

The CHAIRMAN. How large is this organization?

Mr. HOFMANN. Seventy-four German-American societies belong to the Wisconsin Federation of German-American Societies.

The CHAIRMAN. The membership consists of German Americans, or American people of German descent; is that right?

Mr. HOFMANN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. What other organization are you affiliated with?

Mr. HOFMANN. With the Steuben Society of America.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a national organization?

Mr. HOFMANN. That is a national organization.

The CHAIRMAN. It has posts or lodges in practically all States where there are people of German descent?

Mr. HOFMANN. Correct.

The CHAIRMAN. A number of posts in New York?

Mr. HOFMANN. Correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And through the West?

Mr. HOFMANN. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. That is probably the largest German-American society in the United States, is it not?

Mr. HOFMANN. I believe so.

The CHAIRMAN. What attitude has the Wisconsin Federation of German-American Societies, the Milwaukee German-American Federation, and the Steuben Society assumed or taken with reference to the German-American Bund?

Mr. HOFMANN. The leading men in what was formerly known as the Friends of The New Germany—I am referring to Mr. Froboese—they tried to enter into the Wisconsin Federation of German-American Societies. They felt at the beginning that the attitude of the German-Americans as far as they were organized in this group was not very favorable toward them, so they entered the federation as delegates of other German groups, and immediately tried to create disturbance within the Wisconsin Federation of German-American Societies.

Long before the swastika became the German official flag, they tried to force onto the federation this flag, in the German Day parade which was held in Milwaukee. That was in 1935. Then the Wisconsin Federation of German-American Societies decided not to carry any other flag except the American flag, because most of our individual members are American citizens, and feel as such; and ever since that time all our doings have been held under one flag—the American flag. And ever since that time—I may go back and tell that at that time, at that particular meeting, Mr. Froboese was ejected from the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that meeting; about what year? That was the German Day celebration, was it not?

Mr. HOFMANN. Yes, sir; that was about the early part of February 1935.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Froboese was ejected from the meeting, you said?

Mr. HOFMANN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the occasion for that action on the part of the organization?

Mr. HOFMANN. They tried to force the Wisconsin federation to show the swastika flag at the German Day celebration.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, since that date have you permitted the German-American Bund or the Protective League or the German Alliance to become members of your federation?

Mr. HOFMANN. We have not.

The CHAIRMAN. They are not members of either one of the federations or the Steuben Society that you have named?

Mr. HOFMANN. They are not, directly.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you this: Approximately how many people—what proportion of the population of Wisconsin—are people of German descent?

Mr. HOFMANN. I would say about 40 percent of the population of the State of Wisconsin are American citizens of German descent.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, what is the attitude of those people, insofar as you have been able to find out through your contacts and affiliations—what is their attitude with respect to the German-American Bund and the Nazi movement in Germany?

Mr. HOFMANN. They are not in harmony with them and are very much opposed to their tactics.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, when you say tactics—well, before we get to that, you say they are opposed to it. What percentage would you say of the people of German descent are opposed to the German-American Bund and the Nazi movement?

Mr. HOFMANN. I would say that the percentage is so great that at least 99 percent are definitely—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). How many members of the bund and the Protective League and the German Alliance, all put together, would you say they have in Wisconsin?

Mr. HOFMANN. I would judge not more than 400 in the State of Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you were talking about the tactics which they pursued which were so objectionable. Will you explain to us what you mean by the term "tactics"?

Mr. HOFMANN. Their attacks—

The CHAIRMAN. Their what?

Mr. HOFMANN. I say, their attacks on the old established German-American groups are so vicious that it seems as if they want to wreck everything that American citizens of German descent have established in the State of Wisconsin. They have done so by threatening officers of the Wisconsin Federation of German-American Societies, and they have threatened officers of the National Steuben Society.

The CHAIRMAN. When you say "threatened," what do you mean? Now, as a preliminary to what you are going to do, as I understand, you have letters, threatening letters, that members of the Steuben Society or of one of these three organizations that you have been talking about have received through the mails; is that right?

Mr. HOFMANN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not want to disclose the names of the people who received the threats?

Mr. HOFMANN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. But you have already shown those letters to the Chair, shown the addresses and the names and the post marks; and out of respect for your wishes we are not going to compel you to read the names. But read some of the letters—the contents—without reading the names of the persons who received them.

Mr. HOFMANN. You want to hear the whole letter?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HOFMANN (reading):

For a long time I intended to give you a piece of my mind. I say my mind, but it is the mind of thousands of Americans who have the distinction to be of German blood.

If it could be done, I would see to it that you would be deprived of the right to call yourself a German-American, because you have in your make up nothing that is German and you are a very poor American, you are just an ordinary mongrel.

My father used to say—

Well, here is a little paragraph in German. I have to give it; it is in the letter:

Es ist ein schlechter Vogel, der sein eigenes Nest beschmutzt.

In other words, it is a very poor bird who dirties his own nest. That is the translation.

The CHAIRMAN. We have heard that expression used over here.

Mr. HOFMANN (reading) :

You are certainly such a vogel—

That means "such a bird"—

Pfui Deibel!

You know what that means.

But your time will come, Hofmann, and then we shall have a tête-à-tête with each other. Again, Pfui Deibel!

The CHAIRMAN. Now, read us some more. Read that post card that was received.

Mr. HOFMANN. Here is a postal card. That postal card is not even 48 hours old. They sent this to me by air mail—a businessman in Milwaukee. It was sent to an editor of a shopping news in Milwaukee, and it reads:

We bow our heads in shame—

And now the name of the paper, and then:

It has alined itself with Judaism. When that communistic prerogative did take action it sure exposed your mental capacity. You are at least to be congratulated for showing your true colors.

P. S.—When you ask for ads again look this over carefully.

And here is a picture on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. A picture of what?

Mr. HOFMANN. Well, it is a cannon, and it is shooting some material—provocation, speculation, grief, revolt, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know it to be a fact that a great many people in Milwaukee and other parts of Wisconsin have received threatening notes from members of the bund?

Mr. HOFMANN. Yes; definitely so.

The CHAIRMAN. How do they threaten? What does the threat consist of?

Mr. HOFMANN. I want to refer to one particular instance. It came to my knowledge about 2 weeks ago when a lady stopped me on a street corner and told me that she had received a letter, without any signature on it, and she was told that if she made some more remarks about conditions in Vienna their relatives would have to suffer for it across.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, does that illustrate the type of threats that they are making?

Mr. HOFMANN. That is an illustration.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, those people of German descent in America who have relatives in Germany are threatened that their relatives will be done some harm by the Nazi Government; is that right?

Mr. HOFMANN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of many instances of such threats?

Mr. HOFMANN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are American citizens fearful that those threats may be carried out in Germany?

Mr. HOFMANN. Very much so. I have received numerous telephone calls, probably because I am prominent, and probably because I am well known in the city, and I do believe I have the confidence of the German-American people, at least in the State of Wisconsin,

and they have begged me on the telephone not to give their names, because they feared something would happen to their relatives in Germany. To my knowledge I have received at least three such telephone calls.

The CHAIRMAN. When?

Mr. HOFMANN. Within the last 5 or 6 months.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all you have ever received—three?

Mr. HOFMANN. No; I received more, but that is of older date.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, illustrative of the type of threats that are made, have you ever been threatened in the official newspaper of the German-American Bund?

Mr. HOFMANN. Continuously.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, with reference to whether or not you will be permitted to ever return to Germany, what threat was made by Froboese?

Mr. HOFMANN. I want to give you this, in one of Froboese's own newspaper articles. Last year I intended to make a trip with the Steuben Society through seven European countries. The Steuben Society of Milwaukee organized that tour, and members of the Steuben made the trip through those countries. Froboese wrote in the Weckruf—that is their official newspaper in the Middle West—he wrote that the German consul had refused me a permit to go to Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. On what ground?

Mr. HOFMANN. Well, he did not give any grounds. Now, I never applied, for the reason, because I did not have the time to go. For that reason no one could ever have refused me this permit. But in the article Mr. Froboese states—

The CHAIRMAN. Read it. Read the exact language, what he said, and gave us the date.

Mr. HOFMANN. Now, that again is in German.

The CHAIRMAN. What date is it?

Mr. HOFMANN. Just a minute. I want to have this correct. Yes; right here. It is the 18th of August 1938. But he printed this previous to this date. But I have got the article right here, and he states in this article that everyone may expect the same treatment if they don't do what is right; in other words, do what they believe is right.

The CHAIRMAN. What the German Bund believes is right?

Mr. HOFMANN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, if I understand you correctly, those people of German descent in the United States who do not sympathize with the bund and go along with the bund, will be denied permission to go to Germany; is that right?

Mr. HOFMANN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the effect of his article?

Mr. HOFMANN. That is correct. In other words, anyone who wants to go to Germany must in some way get an O. K. here from Froboese.

The CHAIRMAN. Must get an O. K. from Froboese?

Mr. HOFMANN. Of course, he is taking in a lot of territory there.

Mr. Chairman, I have a lot of material here, and later on, if I find that in another issue the statement is made more clearly, may I then change the date of the newspaper? I mean, I said the 13th of October, but it may be that in another newspaper it is still more clearly stated that he threatens everyone in a way that if they do not do what is

right, what they believe, it may happen to them what happened to me.

The CHAIRMAN. I am going to ask Mr. Metcalfe to ask you some questions, as he is thoroughly familiar with your story.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Hofmann, in 1936, did the members of the German-American Bund in Milwaukee plan a trip to Germany?

Mr. HOFMANN. 1936?

Mr. METCALFE. I believe it was 1936; about 40 went along with Froboese?

Mr. HOFMANN. You are talking about the German-American Bund?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

Mr. HOFMANN. I believe it was 1936, but I am not positive.

Mr. METCALFE. Was it not about the time of the Olympic games?

Mr. HOFMANN. It was about that time.

Mr. METCALFE. That would be 1936. They took a train to Chicago as the first lap of that trip?

Mr. HOFMANN. Yes.

Mr. METCALFE. Were you on that train?

Mr. HOFMANN. It happened so.

Mr. METCALFE. When you were on that train, did you see Froboese there with a delegation of the German-American Bund?

Mr. HOFMANN. Yes; I would rather say with the people who wanted to go over to Germany.

Mr. METCALFE. Did you have a conversation on that train with Froboese?

Mr. HOFMANN. A very brief conversation.

Mr. METCALFE. Would you tell us the nature of that conversation?

Mr. HOFMANN. At that time he believed he could win me over to his ideas. He indicated that only a persistent movement could succeed in this country to create other conditions by which he undoubtedly meant another form of Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you do not know what he meant; that is a conclusion on your part, is it?

Mr. HOFMANN. That is a conclusion on my part, but the way it was indicated, it very much meant just that.

Mr. METCALFE. Can you recall any definite statement that he made as to anyone who persistently tries after one thing will eventually obtain it?

Mr. HOFMANN. Well, that was the statement he made.

Mr. METCALFE. With reference to the activities of the German-American Bund as to the overthrow of this Government, changing the form of the Government; was that the discussion?

Mr. HOFMANN. Changing the form of the Government; yes.

Mr. METCALFE. Did he say—or words to that effect—that it would be worth while to you if you would throw the weight of the federation behind the German-American Bund in its objectives to change this form of government?

Mr. HOFMANN. Mr. Metcalfe, that was not said on the train, but that was said previous to that at my home, at my business place.

Mr. METCALFE. Will you tell us the conversation that took place at your home or at your business place with Froboese?

Mr. HOFMANN. Mr. Froboese—that was about a year before this train ride to Chicago; about a year before that time Mr. Froboese

came to my home alone and he tried to convince me that everything that they were doing was right and was good for this country, and he indicated to me that it probably would be better for me to go along because it would do me a lot of good if I did.

Mr. METCALFE. Do you know if there is any close relationship between the activities of the German-American Bund, between Froboese and Mr. Weissflog of the German Travel Agency in Milwaukee?

Mr. HOFMANN. I believe that both were officers, or are still officers, of the German-American Bund.

Mr. METCALFE. Is Mr. Weissflog an official representative of the German steamship lines?

Mr. HOFMANN. I understand he is.

Mr. METCALFE. The North German Lloyd?

Mr. HOFMANN. The Hamburg-American Line and the North German Lloyd; they are combined.

Mr. METCALFE. Is Mr. Weissflog an American citizen?

Mr. HOFMANN. I believe he must be, otherwise he could not have a travel agency in Wisconsin. But that is only my own conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. What is Mr. Weissflog's first name?

Mr. HOFMANN. Bert; that is the only way I know him.

Mr. METCALFE. You say that Mr. Weissflog is or has been an officer of the German-American Bund and yet at the same time the official representative of the North German Lloyd-Hamburg-American Steamship Line and has a travel agency in Milwaukee?

Mr. HOFMANN. That is right.

Mr. METCALFE. Are you familiar with the structure of the German-American Alliance in Milwaukee? Just what is the German-American Alliance, which held a meeting a few nights ago in the auditorium?

Mr. HOFMANN. The German-American Alliance consists of four or five organizations, most of them newly formed within the last 3 or 4 years. I believe there is only one or two that has existed more than 8 or 9 years. But they are newly formed organizations and, I may add, that Mr. Weissflog for a time was an official of this so-called German-American Citizens' Alliance.

Mr. METCALFE. Was Mr. Froboese also active in the German-American Alliance?

Mr. HOFMANN. That I do not know, whether he is directly active.

Mr. METCALFE. It was reported, was it not, that Mr. Froboese was on the platform the other night at the meeting of the German-American Alliance, which was held in the auditorium?

Mr. HOFMANN. Yes.

Mr. METCALFE. He was seen there?

Mr. HOFMANN. Yes; he was seen there at that meeting.

Mr. METCALFE. And who was the main speaker at that gathering?

Mr. HOFMANN. I believe they had two principal speakers there; Bert Weissflog spoke and a certain Dr. Mertz from Chicago spoke, and also, if I recall correctly, Schafer spoke.

Mr. METCALFE. Who is Mr. Schafer?

Mr. HOFMANN. Mr. Schafer is a politician.

Mr. METCALFE. Will you be more specific as to just who he is; is he running for office?

Mr. HOFMANN. Of course, I am familiar with the political set-up in Milwaukee. Most naturally, as a citizen, I am interested. Mr. Schafer, I believe, is running for the United States Congress.

Mr. METCALFE. What is Mr. Schafer's first name?

Mr. HOFMANN. I do not know.

Mr. METCALFE. John C.?

Mr. HOFMANN. I believe it is John C.; I do not know. I think that is the name given in the paper.

Mr. METCALFE. He is the Republican nominee for Congress from the Fourth District of Milwaukee. Was the German-American Alliance at any time a member of the federation?

Mr. HOFMANN. No.

Mr. METCALFE. Is it not a fact that on October 30, when this meeting was held at which Mr. Schafer spoke, 24 persons were arrested; 2,000 persons picketed the gathering and there was a near riot with some 400 policemen patrolling the hall in an effort to keep order?

Mr. HOFMANN. That is correct.

Mr. METCALFE. Is this the first time there has been any trouble where organizations of a Nazi character have held meetings, or has there been trouble before?

Mr. HOFMANN. There has been trouble before.

Mr. METCALFE. Will you recall some of the incidents where there have been riots in Milwaukee before as a result of meetings of the German-American Bund, the alliance, and so forth?

Mr. HOFMANN. I would have to go through my records here. I do not recall the exact dates. But I believe it was last year, when there was a situation in front of the auditorium that became very dangerous. I know that the civic organizations had meetings—I attended some of them—and the civic organizations very much objected to having uniformed people at the Volksbund meetings and they also objected to those people outside, because they were not orderly.

Mr. METCALFE. By uniformed people at the meeting, you mean the storm troops of the German-American Bund, commonly known as the Storm Troop Division?

Mr. HOFMANN. Yes; I believe they are uniformed, and I believe that at our meeting those people were meant when they were referred to as uniformed people.

Mr. METCALFE. Are you familiar with the Silver Shirt activities in Milwaukee?

Mr. HOFMANN. Very little.

Mr. METCALFE. Will you tell the committee what you know of the activities of the Silver Shirts in Milwaukee?

Mr. HOFMANN. The Silver Shirts have held a few meetings in Milwaukee openly, admitting only, I understand, people who had cards; that is, little invitations, and only with those cards could the people enter the meeting halls.

Mr. METCALFE. To your knowledge, has Mr. Froboese been active in the Silver Shirt movement?

Mr. HOFMANN. He has attended some meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. You referred to John P. Schafer. Is he a former Republican Member of Congress?

Mr. HOFMANN. I believe it is the same man.

The CHAIRMAN. I served with a Member by the name of Schafer who, it seems to me, went out in 1932. I am not certain about that. I was wondering if that is the same man. Do you know, Mr. Metcalfe?

Mr. METCALFE. I believe that is the same man. He is a candidate for election, nominated on the Republican ticket.

Mr. HOFMANN. To show that the Alliance in Milwaukee is in sympathy with the Volksbund, I would like to quote Mr. Knauer, who is an official of the German-American Citizens' Alliance. He said that, "We are absolutely in sympathy with the Volksbund, although we are not allied with the bund or the Silver Shirts." But still Mr. Knauer, as an official, made this statement in Milwaukee, that the German-American Citizens' Alliance is in sympathy with the Volksbund.

Mr. METCALFE. Will you definitely identify when that statement was made?

Mr. HOFMANN. That statement was made to a newspaper man in Milwaukee preceding the last meeting in the auditorium.

Mr. METCALFE. Was not there a riot as the result of the German-American Bund celebration a year ago, approximately a year ago, in the auditorium?

Mr. HOFMANN. Yes. Approximately a year ago they had thousands of people marching, picketing the auditorium where the Volksbund held their meeting.

Mr. METCALFE. Was Mr. Froboese again a leading figure at that particular meeting?

Mr. HOFMANN. He was.

Mr. METCALFE. Was Mr. Weissflog active in that meeting?

Mr. HOFMANN. He was present.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Knauer there?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know. Mr. Metcalfe, about a year ago, to show you some of the tactics of which I spoke—about a year ago, when they celebrated German Day at the auditorium, they had 864 people at that meeting. I got those records from authoritative sources in Milwaukee. At the same time, friends of mine were in Germany and 2 days later throughout Germany the following broadcast was given:

Eight thousand of our party members celebrated German Day in Milwaukee. Communists tried to storm the meeting hall. Of course, we won out (that is the party members) and thereafter our celebration was a great success.

That broadcast was made 3 days after the celebration in Milwaukee where actually 864 people attended. In Germany they made it a National Socialist meeting and gave out a statement that more than 8,000 had attended. I just wanted to show in what way the propaganda works.

Mr. METCALFE. Was that a short-wave broadcast from Germany?

Mr. HOFMANN. Short-wave and long-wave.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you know that that happened? Can you give us the source of your information?

Mr. HOFMANN. I would like to give this information to the Chair, but again I would say that if I reveal the names of the people their relatives may be punished for it.

The CHAIRMAN. You got it from German-Americans?

Mr. HOFMANN. Who were over in Germany at the time. They heard the actual broadcast.

The CHAIRMAN. And they came back and told you about it?

Mr. HOFMANN. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. But they are fearful of having their names disclosed; they think some harm might come to their families?

Mr. HOFMANN. Their relatives; a mother and father in Germany. But I am willing to give the name and address, and I believe those people would testify if they were called, if their names could be kept secret. But I am willing to give the name to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Hofmann, are you familiar with or do you know of Ernst Goerner?

Mr. HOFMANN. I heard of him quite a bit.

Mr. METCALFE. Will you tell the committee what you know about Goerner and his activities and where he is seen at various times?

Mr. HOFMANN. I received, as I mentioned before, threatening letters. I turned some of them over to the postal inspector in Milwaukee and I informed the police about receiving threatening letters. Propaganda material was distributed by Mr. Goerner in Milwaukee. That is common knowledge in Milwaukee that Mr. Goerner is doing that. There is no secret about it. I believe scores of people know that he is distributing that propaganda material.

Mr. METCALFE. That is antiracial propaganda?

Mr. HOFMANN. Yes.

Mr. METCALFE. And antireligious propaganda?

Mr. HOFMANN. To a certain extent.

Mr. METCALFE. Is it anti-Government propaganda? In other words, is it pro-Nazi propaganda?

Mr. HOFMANN. Definitely so.

Mr. METCALFE. Is it true that Mrs. Goerner is also active in these things with Mr. Goerner, in the distribution and printing of this material?

Mr. HOFMANN. I do not know.

Mr. METCALFE. You do not know that to be a fact?

Mr. HOFMANN. I do not know.

Mr. METCALFE. Do you know if Mr. Goerner is a member of the Silver Shirts?

Mr. HOFMANN. I do not know. I could not say definitely.

Mr. METCALFE. Do you know if he is a member of the Protective League?

Mr. HOFMANN. I do not know.

Mr. METCALFE. Do you know if he is a member of the German-American Bund?

Mr. HOFMANN. He has attended their meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. When you say antiracial propaganda do you mean anti-Semitic propaganda?

Mr. HOFMANN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe that anyone today who starts—

The CHAIRMAN. You are not answering my question. When you say "anti-racial" do you mean anti-Semitic?

Mr. HOFMANN. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say that the spreading of anti-Semitic propaganda is confined to the German-American Bund or the German Alliance in Wisconsin?

Mr. HOFMANN. I believe it was started by them.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they the only ones engaged in it?

Mr. HOFMANN. I believe today there are more than just the bund doing it.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you believe American citizens are engaged in it?

Mr. HOFMANN. I can only give my opinion. I believe so.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you have to base that on? Have you any instances that you can tell us illustrating that?

Mr. HOFMANN. Yes, I have. I have heard scores of people talk about it and I know that the movement seems to grow. There is definitely an anti-Jewish feeling existing in the Middle West. It is very hard to check who is definitely active in it outside of those names who were mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Hofmann; I believe that is all.

Mr. HOFMANN. Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me, I want to say just a few more words.

As a leader in the German-American movement and as a national leader of the Steuben Society, I would say that the German-Americans have shown their loyalty to this country by their deeds and certainly they should not be thrown into one pot with those people who have not American interests at heart. For that reason I would like to make it clear before this committee that the German-Americans are not on trial; only those who have not acted in good faith toward this Government.

I want to say that those people do not belong to any decent German-American organization in this country. And I want to say that we regret the race hatred spread by them, because this country is comprised of some 54 different nationalities. And if any group is permitted to create race hatred, it will not be long before we will have very deplorable conditions in the United States.

Therefore I believe that all American patriotic organizations should be welded into one national bloc, and I believe that our Government should do everything in its power to help keep and maintain that bloc intact for the good of this country, that is, the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Right there, may I say that the committee is in entire agreement with what you have said. We have made the statement many times that the overwhelming majority of the people of German descent are loyal, patriotic American citizens. Our evidence discloses that the great majority of them are patriotic and loyal. So the Chair is in hearty accord with the statement you have made.

May I ask you this question? Do you feel that any effort to arouse racial or religious hatred is distinctly un-American?

Mr. HOFMANN. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you feel the same way about any effort to arouse and promote class hatred?

Mr. HOFMANN. I do: definitely so.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not classify class hatred with racial and religious hatred? In other words, those who promote class hatred, are they not inviting race and religious hatred?

Mr. HOFMANN. Yes; they are.

The CHAIRMAN. Has not that been the story in Europe, that the first movement started as a movement of class hatred and then came the religious and racial hatred?

Mr. HOFMANN. You are entirely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And many of those who claim to be the champions of racial and religious tolerance are themselves promoting class hatred; is not that a fact?

Mr. HOFMANN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And they are bringing upon their own heads a boomerang in the form of racial or religious hatred; is not that a fact?

Mr. HOFMANN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. So as Americans, we must not only fight racial or religious intolerance, but class intolerance as well?

Mr. HOFMANN. I believe you are correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all, thank you.

TESTIMONY OF LE ROY SCHULZ

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Your name is Le Roy Schulz, I believe.

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are vice-chairman of the Protective League of Milwaukee?

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe their address is 1620 North Farwell Avenue.

Mr. SCHULZ. That is my address.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you lived in Milwaukee?

Mr. SCHULZ. For 25 years.

The CHAIRMAN. What business are you engaged in?

Mr. SCHULZ. Nothing at present.

The CHAIRMAN. What business have you been engaged in?

Mr. SCHULZ. I was employed by J. Greenbaum Tanning Co. as a machine operator.

The CHAIRMAN. You are familiar with the Protective League, are you not?

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have anything to do with the formation of that league?

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When was the league formed? Can you state about the date on which the league was formed?

Mr. SCHULZ. About the middle part of May 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. Who formed the league? You do not have to give the names of all the members of the league, but who were the leaders in forming the league?

Mr. SCHULZ. Mr. Pagenkopf, Mr. Noll, and Mr. Haight.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us something about the formation of this league in your own language.

Mr. SCHULZ. About 3 weeks before I was brought into the Protective League they had already organized to some extent, insofar as taking out organization papers and drawing up the corporation papers was concerned. A member of the league living in the same building that I did asked me to come out to one of their meetings, and this I did on May 18, 1938. At that meeting I was elected vice president. From then on I went to several meetings and there were mostly executive meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the purpose of the league?

Mr. SCHULZ. The purpose of that league was to form a movement to buy gentile—to educate the people to buy gentile.

The CHAIRMAN. To buy at gentile stores?

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. To trade with gentile people.

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that the only purpose?

Mr. SCHULZ. That was a roundabout way. I would say this: That it was a part of the bund. So much pressure had been exerted against the bund that these men thought it would be a good idea to start another organization and take some of the pressure away from the bund.

The CHAIRMAN. Were the men who formed the league members of the bund?

Mr. SCHULZ. I would not say that.

The CHAIRMAN. You said it was a part of the bund.

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir; because Mr. Froboese was present at the executive meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. He was present at the meetings.

Mr. SCHULZ. At about three-fourths of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he an officer?

Mr. SCHULZ. No, sir; he was Mid-West director of the bund.

The CHAIRMAN. Were there any other well-known members of the German-American Bund present?

Mr. SCHULZ. No, sir. There was Mr. Paul Knauer. He was present at the meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he an official of the German-American Bund?

Mr. SCHULZ. He was of the German-American Alliance.

The CHAIRMAN. What other reason did they have besides that for forming the Protective League? You say it was formed to carry on bund activities, and relieve pressure from it.

Mr. SCHULZ. The only purpose I know was that there was too much pressure being exerted on the bund, and they wanted to start this organization, and, as they said, it would be an organization just to carry on the work to buy gentile.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you talk about in the executive meetings?

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Chairman, he has prepared a statement, and from that he can tell you from day to day about the activities.

The CHAIRMAN. You may read the statement.

Mr. SCHULZ. On May 18, 1938, I attended an organization meeting of the Protective League at Forst Keller Hall, 1037 West Juneau Avenue, Milwaukee. B. Harry Haight was acting chairman. Speakers of the evening were William H. Falvey, Attorney Lyman G. Wheeler, and Haight.

Falvey roundly scored the Jews. Harry Haight also made derogatory remarks against the Jewish people. Lyman Wheeler was conservative in his remarks. He talked mostly about organization.

Election of officers and board of directors were: President, B. Harry Haight; vice president, Le Roy Schulz; secretary, William H. Falvey; treasurer, Edward Feller. Board of directors were: August C. Pagenkopf, Paul Knauer, and Robert Noll.

George Froboese, Midwest director of the bund, was nominated for the board of directors but declined, saying he did not wish to have his name connected with the Protective League, because it would draw unfavorable publicity, but said he would do everything in his power in an advisory capacity.

A collection was taken to defray expenses and the money turned over to the treasurer, Ed. Feller.

Following the meeting, William Falvey, Harry Haight, Thomas Hamilton, Mr. and Mrs. Rudolph Deckert walked home on Juneau Avenue, proceeded east for 10 blocks and posted on sidewalks, posts, windows, doors, and all other convenient places the "Buy gentile" stickers.

One week later, on May 25, an executive meeting was held at the offices of Lyman Wheeler. Members present were: Ernst Goerner, Robert Noll, August Pagenkopf, Ed. Feller, Lyman Wheeler, B. H. Haight, Lawrence C. Cressey, Paul Knauer, George Froboese, and myself.

After the executive meeting was called to order, Mr. Froboese asked for the floor and then proceeded to give a scorching denunciation of "those rats, the reporters," who in his words are "the world's damndest liars." He then told the board that we would have to build a strong and active militant organization to combat these damnable invasions of our personal rights. He said if it becomes necessary we must crush and destroy, to show that we will not tolerate any meddling.

Goerner, Pagenkopf, and Feller emphatically agreed with him that a militant organization would be an absolute necessity. Noll, Wheeler, and Haight expressed themselves against this method of organization and said they believed that a quiet method of organizing would be more sensible.

Pagenkopf at this point said that we in America must do as the other countries are doing in persecuting the Jews. He said the only way to start a move which will rid this country of Jews is to drag them down the streets by their hair or hang them on the nearest limb. He said such action as this would show the Jews what they could expect from that time on. He also said he wished that plans could be laid immediately for the beginning of a militant organization.

Mr. Noll read letters to the committee telling how organizations of this type are flourishing throughout the country.

On or about the first part of June Harry Haight, president of the Protective League, was in possession of a letter signed and given to him by August C. Pagenkopf, a director of the Protective League, giving him permission to solicit funds for the Protective League.

Mr. Haight asked me to accompany him, because he wanted me to become acquainted with the members, who probably did not know me as the vice president. Also, in the event he could not be available, then I could make collections.

On this particular day we visited a barber shop. The proprietor told us he had not as yet seen some of his friends, who were going to contribute. Our next stop was the Garfield Garage on North Third Street, where a man made the statement that all the extra cash he had had gone for the printing of anti-Semitic literature, but said he would try to collect some money in other channels. Next stop

was a tavern where the tavern keeper gave Mr. Haight \$2 for which he gave him a receipt.

A board meeting was held at the Highland Cafe about 3½ weeks after the Protective League had held its meeting at the Forst Keller Hall. It was held at the Highland Cafe because Mr. Wheeler had made a long trip that day, and did not want to come to his office.

Attending this meeting were Froboese, Knauer, Noll, Feller, and myself.

At this meeting Mr. Froboese spoke feelingly of the dire need for a militant organization or group. He spoke against the Jews venomously and as a parting shot said all Jews must be brought to their knees or eradicated. He said they were entirely to blame for the suffering of the masses of today.

Mr. Noll brought with him letters purporting to show the activities of similar groups. These letters showed that groups of this nature were working quietly and with much success.

Mr. Knauer said that if any more public meetings of the Protective League were held, he would have some of his men from the German-American Alliance see to it that there would be no more snooping or spying.

Mr. Feller said that he would begin at once recruiting men for a militant group. All of them agreed that a definite action and a determined stand must be made against the Jews.

A board meeting was held on June 8, at the law office of Lyman Wheeler. Present at the meeting were Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Pagenkopf, Mr. Noll, Mr. Feller, Mr. Knauer, Mr. Goerner, Mr. Haight, Mr. Cressey, and myself. Mr. Froboese came later.

It was at this meeting that Mr. Haight made the complaint that one of the board members had made unfair and insulting remarks about him. He then stated that if anyone thought he was not capable of handling the office of president he would resign. Mr. Pagenkopf demanded that Mr. Haight resign immediately, on the grounds that he was incompetent and that he lacked executive ability and the foresight which is needed to manage the presidency.

After a sharp exchange of words between Mr. Haight and Mr. Pagenkopf, Mr. Haight, over the objections of Mr. Noll, Mr. Knauer, and Mr. Froboese, resigned as president of the Protective League. He said however that his sympathies lie with this movement and that he would do everything he could to make it flourish.

After Mr. Haight had written his resignation, Mr. Pagenkopf stated it was a closed meeting and demanded that Mr. Haight leave immediately. With tears in his eyes and a choked voice he said good-bye.

After Mr. Haight left, the executive board got down to work. Plans were made for another meeting at the Highland Cafe. Mr. Feller was asked to get estimates of a pamphlet. A discussion also took place as to how to raise the money. Mr. Wheeler said that a good business manager would have to be found to solicit money for the organization.

Mr. Noll by some correspondence showed the committee that the feeling against the Jews was intense throughout the United States. Knauer, Pagenkopf, and Goerner asserted that we must not wait but must organize into a strong unit so that when the day comes for action we will be ready. Mr. Froboese handed Mr. Feller, treasurer

of the Protective League, a check for \$3, adding that this was money that he had solicited for the Protective League. The meeting adjourned with the committee agreeing to meet in 2 weeks.

On or about June 15, 1938, in a conversation that took place at 1620 North Farwell Avenue, between Mr. Froboese, Mr. Feller, and myself, Mr. Froboese made the following remarks. He contended that "the God-damned organization, the C. I. O., that the 'kikes' ruled" was to blame for him losing his job. He stated that before he was through with those "rotten kikes" they would know that they were in a battle. He also said that that "rat attorney," meaning Arthur W. Richter, attorney for the C. I. O. union, would find out that this time that he had bit off more than he could chew. He said that unless the Jews were wiped out we would soon be under their complete domination.

At the next board meeting held at Lyman, Wheeler's office, the following were present: Mr. Froboese, Mr. Knauer, Mr. Noll, Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Feller, Mr. Goerner, and myself. It was suggested by Mr. Knauer that a group be chosen to appear before the common council to protest the Soref resolution, which would revoke tavern licenses for places where secret organizations are allowed to meet. Mr. Froboese, Mr. Knauer, and myself were chosen. Nothing unusual took place at this board meeting except that each member took his turn at deriding the Jews. Mr. Wheeler stated that so far he had been unable to find a suitable man for the business management of the Protective League.

The following day Mr. Froboese, Mr. Knauer, and myself sat in the chambers of the common council the entire afternoon expecting the Soref resolution to come up for consideration. However, no action was taken on this resolution on this particular day, whereupon Mr. Froboese, Mr. Knauer, and myself walked to the first floor where we met Alderman John Schultz and questioned him on the resolution. He stated that the resolution would come up before his committee in about 2 weeks, at which time we would be notified.

Mr. METCALFE. Will you explain there what that resolution was that was passed by the city council? Are you familiar with it?

Mr. SCHULZ. No, sir.

Mr. METCALFE. That resolution prohibited secret meetings being held in taverns or restaurants.

The CHAIRMAN. That was a resolution before the city council of Milwaukee.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. The resolution was known as the Soref resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. You may continue with your statement.

Mr. SCHULTZ. However, not being content with Alderman Schultz's statement, we went directly to the office of the city clerk, and asked Mr. E. J. Gut, the city clerk, for a copy of the resolution. He told us that he did not have any printed as yet, but if we wished we could copy the original resolution. Mr. Knauer copied it word for word.

On or about September 16, 1938, Mr. Bernard Arrow and myself visited Mr. Froboese at his home. In the conversation that followed our talk turned to the coming primary election. Mr. Froboese stated that he was 100 percent for the Republican Party. He said that he hoped he could gain enough political strength in order to be given national recognition in his politics in 1940. He also stated that his

interest in actively backing candidates was to be able to clean out the city hall in 1940.

Mr. Arrow, a Republican candidate for the State assembly in the first district, combining the first and third wards, asked Mr. Froboese if he couldn't do something to help him. Mr. Froboese said that he had been endorsed by the bund, and that letters would be sent to all members instructing them to vote for him in addition to the other Republican members that the bund was supporting.

He also stated that Angelo Cerminara, the Italian consul, was a very good friend of his, and would do everything in his power to help. Mr. Froboese also stated that he has many friends among the Italians in the third ward.

Mr. Froboese also stated that many members of the bund live on the upper East Side. He said the Silver Shirts and the bund were backing the same Republican candidates. He said the main issue today is the Communist issue, and further said he thinks if the Republicans are victorious they will stamp out this "red" menace.

In a telephone conversation around September 9 with Mr. Froboese in regard to the Protective League, Mr. Froboese stated that if nothing was done within a short time he would take over the Protective League management. He also said that he would see Mr. Wheeler during the week to see what was being done to hold a Protective League meeting.

On or about September 10 I had occasion to visit Mr. Goerner at his home at 627 East State Street. He stated that the only reason we have two major political parties is because the Jews want to keep the people divided. He further stated that he is working on a plan that he will come out with in a very short time which has to do with eliminating both the Democratic and Republican Parties and setting up a People's Party. He said that the reason the Jews favor two or more parties is to keep the people fighting among themselves and thereby losing sight of the real issue of the day.

The CHAIRMAN. You heard all of those conversations yourself.

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. None of that is hearsay.

Mr. SCHULZ. I talked to those gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you make notes of the various conversations?

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have reduced to writing exactly what took place?

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You heard it?

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are swearing that is true yourself?

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed with your statement.

Mr. SCHULZ. Speaking of world affairs, Goerner admitted that the time is not far off when the people will rise up in arms and destroy those who have stood over them with an iron hand. He stated that all our troubles and sufferings can be laid at the doors of the Jews. He stated further that President Roosevelt could and would help the people of America out of their dilemma if he were not a Jew and if he were not insane.

He said he had been fighting the Jews for 20 years and all their efforts to stop him have been nil. He stated if he could have had the

proper finances he would have riled up the people long ago to such an extent that the Jews would have found it dangerous to venture outside without protection. He said he hoped some day he can get enough money to carry out his work properly.

Bernard Arrow and I visited Mr. Froboese at his home on or about September 16. We talked about politics for some time, and Mr. Froboese told us the candidates that the Silver Shirt and the bund were backing. I asked him when the bund was going to have another meeting and he said that up to this date he hadn't made any plans. I told him I thought if he held another meeting there would be a riot because of the many groups that would picket. He became very angry and said, getting to his feet: "I am the master. If they try to stop us we will crush and trample them to the ground."

On October 3, 1938, Mr. Feller, treasurer of the Protective League, phoned Mr. Froboese and said he would like to speak to him regarding the league. A meeting was held at the Highland Cafe on October 4. Present were: Mr. Feller, Mr. Arrow, Mr. Froboese, and myself.

Mr. Froboese stated that Mr. Pagenkopf and Mr. Noll had lost their jobs for distributing anti-Semitic literature. Both are members of the Protective League and are on the board of directors.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever have more than seven in the league?

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many did you actually have in the league? How many members did you actually have in the league?

Mr. METCALFE. We will later introduce a list of the members, with their own signatures.

The CHAIRMAN. Members of the league?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. SCHULZ. He also talked about the court decision handed down that day, ordering the auditorium board to rent a hall to the German-American Citizens' Alliance. He said that he knew right from the start what the court's decision would be. He also told us how the Jews had managed to get his job through their "dirty methods." In a strong language he condemned Mr. Daniel Sobol, an attorney, Mr. Meyer Adelman of the C. I. O., and Mr. Max Geline, C. I. O. attorney. In departing he said he wished to be informed of any new developments.

I visited at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Ernst Goerner on Tuesday, October 18. I talked with them for about 2½ hours. Mr. Goerner stated that the Jews had offered \$2,000 to smash the Protective League. He said he was still trying to find out whom the offer had been made to.

Mrs. Goerner stated that, depending on the outcome of the election for Governor, a meeting will be held in Chicago sometime in January. She stated that this meeting would be held for the purpose of combining all of the organizations into one group—organizations such as the Bund, Silver Shirts, Alliance, Protective League, and all other anti-Jewish organizations.

Mrs. Goerner stated that she has interested certain parties in Milwaukee about financing this movement. They told her that they were very much interested, but that they would prefer to wait until after the election before making any decision.

Mr. and Mrs. Goerner both stated that "that dirty Communist rat, Governor La Follette," must be defeated at any or all costs. Moreover, they stated that in the event that he is reelected, there is no doubt in their minds that blood will flow before long.

She said that the members in the different organizations are becoming tired of using words in their effort to smash the Jews. She also said when these organizations are combined they will rise up and resort to any means to get rid of the Jews. She said the best and most effective way to eradicate them is to murder them.

When I asked her if she really meant murder, she became defiant and sarcastic and said there was nothing to bad for the Jews. She also said that once started the anti-Jewish organizations will stop at nothing to gain their ends.

The CHAIRMAN. I really think you have given us enough to show what this league is. I think you have given us enough to show the type of conversations held and the mental caliber of the people engaged in this work. Is there anything else there that should be read?

Mr. METCALFE. It is all practically along the same lines.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the same thing.

Mr. METCALFE. It is practically along the same line.

The CHAIRMAN. How many members does the league have?

Mr. SCHULZ. At the meeting I attended of the Protective League there were about 300 present.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether all of them were members?

Mr. SCHULZ. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Some of them may have come through curiosity.

Mr. SCHULZ. That may be true.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know how many members they have?

Mr. SCHULZ. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it a dead organization or is it functioning now?

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir; it is functioning.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have the membership list?

Mr. METCALFE. I have a series of exhibits to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you secure those exhibits yourself?

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. These receipts?

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you secure them?

Mr. SCHULZ. From the treasurer.

The CHAIRMAN. And those receipts you have given to Mr. Metcalfe?

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The reason I asked is because I want to identify them. Are there any documents you want to introduce?

Mr. METCALFE. There are some receipts, lists of contributions, and so forth. There are receipts for various things, printing leaflets, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. All of these receipts and other documents that you have surrendered to Mr. Metcalfe are receipts and documents which you yourself secured while vice president of the Protective League?

Mr. SCHULZ. They were not secured personally.

The CHAIRMAN. You secured them from the treasurer?

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes, sir; that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything else you can add?

Mr. SCHULZ. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Metcalfe, with your exhibits.

Mr. METCALFE. I will introduce these receipts as an exhibit, and will ask Mr. Schulz to read this one.

Mr. SCHULZ. This reads:

Paid to E. Goerner \$1.00 for 25 Free Press, April 28th, 1938.

Mr. METCALFE. The Free Press is a publication that was introduced in evidence at a previous hearing. The Christian Free Press, I believe, is the full name of the publication.

(The matter referred to was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 1, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. I have here a series of notations, apparently, of contributions made by various persons to the Protective League. They give the names of people who contributed money to the Protective League, with the amounts. I will ask Mr. Schulz to read them.

Mr. SCHULZ (reading the notations):

Leonard Kahn, 2308 W. Wis.; salesman; washing machines (Maytag); Gentile, not to be listed; 2.00.

Huldo Peters, 2460 W. Vliet.; 5 & Dime; listed, 1.00.

Alice Hamann, 620 N. 17th St.; nurse, .50; not to be listed.

Ben Schmoldt, 779 N. Front; club manager; listed, 3.00.

Hans Stender, 107 E. Wells St.; tavern; listed, 1.00.

Dr. Henry Kieren, 747 N. 27th St.; dentist; not listed, \$1.00.

Mike Pisek, 1225 N. 11th St.; tavern, 1.00; listed.

Norman Klug, 2842 N. 47th St.; lawyer; not listed.

L. H. Nohran, 2308 W. Wis. Ave.; salesman; hosiery; Bear Brand Hosiery Company, Chicago; gentile-owned; not to be listed; 1.50.

Wm. Eckenrod, 3030 N. Craemer; barber; not listed; \$.50.

Fred Laser, 821 N. 27th St.; to be listed; jeweler; \$2.50.

R. C. Schodron, 747 N. 27th St.

(The above notations were marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 2, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. I offer a receipt, dated May 4, 1938. Will you read it, Mr. Schulz?

Mr. SCHULZ (reading):

May 4th, 1938.

Received from A. C. Pagenkopf Fifty cents—Dollars, for Notary Fee—\$.50.

L. C. CRESSEY.

(The above receipt was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 3, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. Here is another receipt dated May 11, 1938, and I will ask Mr. Schulz to read it.

Mr. SCHULZ (reading):

MAY 11TH, 1938.

Received from Dr. Schodron five and no Dollars. \$5.00.

PROTECTIVE LEAGUE.

A. C. PAGENKOPF, Treas.

(The above receipt was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 4, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. Read this one dated May 18, 1938.

Mr. SCHULZ (reading) :

MAY 18, 1938.

Received of Protective League Three and no/100 Dollars, hall rent—\$3.00.

FORSTKELLER

RICHARD HAMMANN.

(The above receipt was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 5, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. I will ask you to read this one on the bill head of "Humphrey Press."

Mr. SCHULZ (reading) :

HUMPHREY PRESS

Artists and Printers

504 North Water Street—MARquette 3637

Due May 16/38 A. C. Pagenkopf \$2.35, for stamps and envelopes.

(The above matter was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 6, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. I will ask you to read this receipt of Lyman G. Wheeler.

Mr. SCHULZ (reading) :

"LYMAN G. WHEELER & LYMAN E. WHEELER

Lawyers

516 Caswell Block—152 W. Wisconsin Ave.

MAY 3RD, 1938.

Received of August Pagenkopf five dollars for Secy of State fee for articles of organization of the Protective League.

LYMAN G. WHEELER.

(The above receipt was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 7, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. I will ask you to read this one.

Mr. SCHULZ (reading) :

Received of Mr. A. Pagenkopf \$1.00, payment in full on paper and mimeographing.

E. B. JARETT.

May 2, 1938.

(The above receipt was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 8, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. SCHULZ (reading) :

500 large petition forms, ruled and printed----- \$4.50

2000 gummed labels, printed on pink gum paper----- 5.00

Total----- 9.50

Received payment, M. Bach.

Mr. METCALFE. What does it say there [indicating]?

Mr. SCHULZ. Protective League, Milwaukee.

(The paper referred to was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 9, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. SCHULZ (reading) :

May 10, 1938. Protective League, to Bach Printing Co.

5,000 gummed labels, printed on pink paper-----	\$7.50
Paid May 11-----	5.00
Balance-----	2.50

(The paper referred to was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 10, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. SCHULZ (reading) :

Protective League, Branch No. 1, Milwaukee, May 18, 1938, to Bach Printing Co.

Printing 100 letterheads-----	\$1
-------------------------------	-----

(The paper referred to was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 11, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. SCHULZ (reading) :

May 4, 1938. Protective League, to Bach Printing Co.

500 admission cards (Highland Cafe)-----	\$2.75
--	--------

(The paper referred to was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 12, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. SCHULZ (reading) :

Hahn Letter Service, Inc.

Protective League, A. C. Pagenkopf, 3119 Plankinton Building, by Mr. Gorner. To mimeographing services, including paper-----	\$3.50
---	--------

(The paper referred to was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 13, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. Will you explain this confidential invitation card which bears your name?

Mr. SCHULZ (reading) :

Confidential Invitation. Admit, Monday, May 9, 1938.

Name: Leroy Schulz.

Address: 1620 North Farwell Avenue.

Good only when countersigned by person extending invitation.

Invited by Edward Feller.

Mr. METCALFE. Will you explain to the chairman the circumstances surrounding that card? Where did you use that card?

Mr. SCHULZ. I never used this card. I never used a card. I was identified by people at the door who knew me.

(The card referred to was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 14, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. Now I show you a series of photostatic copies of applications for membership, in the actual handwriting of various persons. I would like to have you read them.

The CHAIRMAN. Just read the names of the persons. The applications are all the same, are they not?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes. Read the names, and if you can identify the persons named, will you do so? I mean, if there is anyone outstanding in the community.

Mr. SCHULZ. I do not know all of them. [Reading:]

We, the undersigned gentiles, hereby apply for membership in the Protective League, a nonstock Wisconsin corporation.

Mr. METCALFE. Now read the names.

Mr. SCHULZ. And the addresses?

Mr. METCALFE. That is not necessary. We do not need the addresses.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Metcalfe, suppose you read the names.

Mr. METCALFE. He is more familiar with them than I am.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. We do not care about the addresses.

Mr. SCHULZ (reading):

Edward Hawkins, V. N. White, Robert J. Bartz.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you spell those out?

Mr. SCHULZ. I can't see these very well.

Mr. METCALFE. The handwriting is poor in most cases.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; do the best you can.

Mr. SCHULZ (reading):

Jacob Swerken, Paul Schuetze, Richard Doerfein, Edwin Larson, Joseph Wippel.

Claire M. Merten, 3027 Twenty-fourth Place, is a candidate for the assembly on the Republican ticket.

Joseph C. Armann, Howard Richardson, Frank J. Haye, Carl M. Seifert, L. B. Crane, Henry Joyce, Mr. and Mrs. William Gier, Paul Neuhausen, John—

I don't know what that is—

Wilhelm Lemke, N. E. Daemling, Adam Schulz, Herman Neuman, H. Huebner, George Beraud, F. Boeckenhaupt.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose we put all of those in the record, as exhibits.

Mr. SCHULZ. Paul Knauer, vice president of the German-American Alliance.

(The papers referred to were marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 15, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. I hand you another exhibit, in reference to the statement which you read in which it was stated that Mr. B. H. Haight had resigned as president of the Protective League. Will you please read that to the committee?

Mr. SCHULZ (reading):

MILWAUKEE, WIS., June 8, 1938.

To the Protective League:

Please accept my resignation as president of the Protective League, to take effect from this day.

B. H. HAIGHT.

(The paper referred to was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 16, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. Read this list of names here [handing paper to the witness.]

The CHAIRMAN. Let those names go in the record.

(The paper referred to was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 17, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. We have here an additional exhibit, being a mailing list, consisting of two pages of names, also obtained from Pittsburgh—a mailing list of the Protective League.

The CHAIRMAN. Let that go in as an exhibit.

(The paper referred to was marked "Schulz Exhibit No. 18, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. We have in addition an affidavit in which it is alleged that Mr. John C. Schaefer publicly stated that he is a Silver Shirt, and made the statement in the presence of at least 10 persons in a restaurant.

The CHAIRMAN. Who made that statement?

Mr. METCALFE. John C. Schaefer. The affidavit is signed by Irving Rasmussen.

The CHAIRMAN. This is an affidavit made by Irving Rasmussen on the 2d day of November 1938 before Sam M. Kaufman, notary public, Milwaukee County, Wis.

Who is this man Irving Rasmussen?

Mr. METCALFE. He is employed at the location where the remarks were overheard.

The CHAIRMAN. He overheard this at a lunch counter?

Mr. METCALFE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Let that go in as an exhibit.

(The affidavit referred to was marked "John C. Metcalfe Exhibit No. 2, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. I have here an original letter signed by Ernst Goerner and addressed to Julius P. Heil, candidate for Governor on the Republican ticket. The letter attacks Mr. Heil.

The CHAIRMAN. The letter will be received as an exhibit.

(The letter referred to was marked "John C. Metcalfe Exhibit No. 3, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. I have an additional exhibit, being an original of an article written by Ernst Goerner, which I obtained in Pittsburgh. As previously stated in former sessions of the committee, Mr. Goerner has been spreading Nazi propaganda and propaganda of that character all over the United States. You will recall that we found his literature in packages which came from Germany. Here is an article which he sent to the editor of the Pittsburgh Sonntagsbote, which is a German paper in the Pittsburgh area. The article was never published because of its nature. It is entitled "The Pending Revolution and How Modern Revolutions are Made."

The CHAIRMAN. Hand it to the reporter.

(The paper referred to was marked "John C. Metcalfe Exhibit No. 4, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. I have also a letter written by Mr. Goerner to the editor of the same paper, and this letter accompanied the article. That also was obtained in Pittsburgh in the investigation there.

The CHAIRMAN. Give it to the reporter.

(The letter referred to was marked "John C. Metcalfe Exhibit No. 5, November 5, 1938.")

Mr. METCALFE. I believe that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Schulz, are you now the vice president of the Protective League?

Mr. SCHULZ. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you go into the league because you were in sympathy with it, or in order to get information?

Mr. SCHULZ. Not at all; just curious.

The CHAIRMAN. You went in there just out of curiosity?

Mr. SCHULZ. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And why did you happen to get this information?

Mr. SCHULZ. Well, after hearing these gentlemen talk, I could not sympathize at all with what they said.

The CHAIRMAN. So you made a notation of it?

Mr. SCHULZ. I made a notation each time.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all. We thank you very much, Mr. Schulz. I want to ask just one question of Mr. Hofmann.

TESTIMONY OF BERNHARD HOFMANN—Resumed

The CHAIRMAN. Is there or is there not a movement on foot now to combine all the patriotic organizations—the Steuben Society, the Federation of German-American Clubs, the American Legion, and so forth? Is there such a movement?

Mr. HOFMANN. Yes, sir; it is contemplated.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you propose to fight, or to oppose, or to advocate?

Mr. HOFMANN. We are only interested in one ismus, and that is the American ismus, and we do that because our children are born in this country, and are going to American institutions, and truly get the benefits of a democratic country, as is the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you oppose communism the same as fascism and nazi-ism?

Mr. HOFMANN. Very much so. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out, however, that the rank and file of all those organizations are just as fine and good citizens as we are; but I want to point out again that there are those agitators who come here to this country injecting foreign politics, and that those people should be stopped by some authority.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about this Protective League? Does it amount to anything there?

Mr. HOFMANN. I do not know very much of it. I know it is in existence, and I know from hearsay that they are collecting funds, but otherwise I do not know very much about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they many members; do you know?

Mr. HOFMANN. That I could not say. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we thank you very much.

Judge Cobb, will you take the stand, please?

TESTIMONY OF JAMES A. COBB

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

Mr. COBB. My name is James A. Cobb.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you an attorney?

Mr. COBB. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. Where are your offices?

Mr. COBB. 613 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. When were you admitted to the bar of the District of Columbia?

Mr. COBB. In January 1902.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were you born, and what educational institutions have you attended?

Mr. COBB. I was born in Arcadia, La. I attended Straight College in New Orleans and Fisk University in Nashville, Tenn., and I hold three degrees from Howard University.

The CHAIRMAN. What are those degrees?

Mr. COBB. Bachelor of philosophy, bachelor of laws, and master of laws.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been connected with any institutions of learning in the District of Columbia?

Mr. COBB. I have.

The CHAIRMAN. State what institution or institutions and in what capacity you have been associated with them.

Mr. COBB. I have been connected with Howard University for a number of years; since 1916 as an instructor and professor of law at Howard University. It also acted as attorney for the university for a number of years. I was also on the university council for a number of years.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you held any appointive offices?

Mr. COBB. I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you please enumerate them?

Mr. COBB. I was designated by the late President Theodore Roosevelt as Special Assistant to the Attorney General, assigned to the United States Attorney's Office of the District of Columbia, and I served under Attorneys General Bonaparte, Wickersham, Mr. Justice McReynolds, and Attorney General Gregory.

The CHAIRMAN. What other organizations have you been connected with?

Mr. COBB. I have been connected with a large number of civic organizations of the District of Columbia that make for the betterment of the welfare of the city, such as the community chest, of which I am one of the executive committee members and one of the trustees.

I am also a director of the Northwest Settlement House, and I am a trustee of the minor normal fund board. I was a member of the Prettyman committee, which committee made recommendations concerning the codification of governmental activities and boards in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. You served as municipal judge, did you not?

Mr. COBB. I was judge for 10 years here—municipal judge.

The CHAIRMAN. Under how many administrations?

Mr. COBB. I was appointed by President Coolidge, and served under President Coolidge, and was reappointed by President Hoover and served until June 1935.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been subpoenaed to appear before our committee and testify?

Mr. COBB. I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you acquainted with Mordecai W. Johnson, now president of Howard University, Washington, D. C.?

Mr. COBB. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what is the attitude of Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University, toward communism?

Mr. COBB. I do, both from hearing him personally and from reading his published utterances.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you prepared to submit proof to the Committee on Un-American Activities of the fact that Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University, has publicly advocated the doctrines of communism?

Mr. COBB. I am. I think that the evidence which I will offer to the committee, which consists of an investigation conducted by the Acting Secretary of the Interior, with respect to alleged communistic activities at Howard University in Washington, D. C., together with certain newspaper clippings reporting his addresses, and in addition the fact that I heard some of these statements made, in my opinion, will be sufficient to satisfy this committee that Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University, has publicly advocated the doctrines of communism.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you then proceed with your statement?

Mr. COBB. To begin with, Mr. Chairman, in order to familiarize this committee with the subject matter, I must briefly review the history of Howard University. It was incorporated by the act of March 2, 1867, and was granted by its charter powers usually vested in private corporations. In 1879 the first Federal appropriation was made to the university and since that date annual appropriations have been made for the "payment of salaries of officers, professors, teachers, and other regular employees, the balance of which is to be paid from donations or other sources." The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to regulate its affairs only insofar as Congress has specifically provided. Under the act of June 1, 1898, Congress merely required that the officers of the university should submit an annual report setting forth the manner in which the appropriation for the preceding year had been expended. In this statute, however, a proviso stated that: "No part thereof (of this appropriation) shall be paid to said university until it shall accord to the Secretary of the Interior, or to his designated agent or agents, authority to visit and inspect such university and to control and supervise the expenditure therein of all moneys paid under this appropriation (30 Stat. 634)."

Although it was said by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, in the recent case of *Maitico Construction Co. Inc., v. United States*, decided July 25, 1935, that "we reached the conclusion that Howard University is a private institution" nevertheless since 1928 Howard University has in fact been a Federalized institution, receiving funds from the Federal Government with the same regularity and informality which is accorded to other Federal institutions.

It would thus appear that Howard University is a quasi-governmental educational institution, for it receives an annual appropriation from the Congress of the United States of approximately \$600,000; and in addition thereto the Government has under construction at Howard University buildings the value of which will reach into the millions.

Mordecai W. Johnson, now president of Howard University, was elected president in 1926, and was previously pastor of a Baptist

church in Charleston, W. Va. By virtue of the fact that Mordecai W. Johnson was the first colored man to be elected president of Howard University, more tolerance has been shown to his administration by the alumni association of that university, and by colored leaders everywhere, and even by the white trustees than would ordinarily be accorded the president of such an institution.

As early as 1928 there are evidences of communistic leanings on the part of President Mordecai W. Johnson, as shown by the following excerpts, reporting an address by him at Pittsburgh, Pa., from page 29 of Senate Document No. 217, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session.

MR. CHAIRMAN. I have my notes. I want to make a correction here. That speech was made in Cleveland, Ohio, and reported in the Pittsburgh Courier of that date.

Speaking of peace—
he said—

look to Soviet Russia. There something has happened that it would be well for every westerner to reflect upon with an unbiased mind. Russia has declared that she has no designs on any country and has thereby made herself a beacon light for all civilization east and west. What is Russia doing that is meritorious? She is using her wealth and power for the emancipation of the masses to whom it belongs. America would do well to stop and consider the value of Soviet Russia.

The Negro is carefully watching Soviet Russia. You have offered no alternative to him. You have given him no consideration, and you likewise have offered him nothing. I do not believe that either God or man will long be satisfied with your domination and ruthless exploitation of the black races. If you believe that you will tolerate such condition—you are worthy of pity and I cannot think that you would so damn your God as to believe that He would approve such conditions. We do not believe that much longer the overfed, overfat, largely unproductive, materially and spiritually few, will be tolerated as lords of industry and as the leaders of the land. We darker people, since we have not been offered any alternative, are forced to choose between national aggressiveness, exploitation, and domination of Russia. Which it shall be depends on you.

In the Chicago Defender, dated Saturday, June 10, 1933, there is an account of an address given by Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University, to the seniors of the university, as follows:

HOWARD UNIVERSITY PREXY ENDORSES COMMUNISM—MORDECAI JOHNSON IN SERMON URGES SENIORS TO ADOPT NEW PLANS

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 9.—Endorsing Russian communism, Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University, in his baccalaureate sermon urged the seniors of the university to think out a new plan of living for the masses. Traditional religions have broken down and the church, Catholic and Protestant, is in a state of chaos and confusion, he asserted. In Russia and Spain, he pointed out, the church has been excommunicated.

BIBLE NOW INEFFECTIVE

"In the United States today and in the world," he said, "there is a profound tendency to teach that the salvation of human kind cannot be effectively directed from the ancient churches which have rested upon the external authority of the Bible.

"On the other hand, vast masses of people have gathered themselves together in the cities, where the control of life is manifestly in the hands of a few men. They know the men who control their lives. They are the men who own the public utilities, the great manufacturing establishments, who dictate political appointments in the State, and whose money furnishes the means to get their candidates elected.

"The people are becoming cynical about the beliefs in God, about the power of God to intervene in modern city affairs, and more and more to believe that salvation lies in some silent movement on their own part."

SEES A NEW RELIGION

"It must be apparent to every man that there is confusion and chaos among the churches in their relations with one another; that they are on the defensive against the material and realistic convictions of the people growing out of their unhappy experiences in the cities.

"Adding to that difficulty, there arises in the world a country which has more than 150,000,000 population—a new religion which comprehensively sets out to grasp the economic, the political, the family life, and the future of mankind in one synthetic and powerful view."

He is referring to Russia.

"This new religion," he said "is called Communism" and is "based upon the determination to make economic and political institutions, the family life and personal relations subject themselves and be ordered by this comprehensive believe that is intrusted in the hands of the church."

"In the Western World," Dr. Johnson said, "we are afraid of that religion. We have sought to break it down by the use of armies. We have failed and refused to recognize the state brought to pass by that religion, and we are on our guard lest by any means these beliefs generate into the body of our national life.

"At the very moment when we are declaring from every American pulpit the destructive character of that religion we are giving this world the most far-reaching political and economic corruption that any nation has ever seen."

BEWARE OF NAMES

After describing the workings of communism in Russia and Hitlerism in Germany, Dr. Johnson declared that "it is manifest in the United States that we shall not be able to resist the powerful impact of these new religions upon the world by a mere negative criticism of them. The only way to resist a great religion in which we do not believe is to produce and follow with purity of heart a great religion in which we do believe. We are in process of forming that religion in the United States. The fermentation of it is going on in the very midst of the churches and in the very midst of institutions which are failing and know they are inadequate."

Dr. Johnson urged his hearers not to allow the words "communism" and "socialism" to "blind their eyes to the realization that on Russian soil today—it makes no difference what mistakes are being made or what crimes are being committed—there is a movement for the first time in the history of the world to make available the natural resources for the life of the common man."

He explained that he is "in hearty sympathy with those who want to preserve our American system, but the preservation of our system is not the primary urgency. The primary urgency is to work out some way to use the scientific and technical resources of life for the emancipation of the people."

Under the same date, June 10, 1933, Louis Lautier, then and now employed as a stenographer in the Department of Justice, made the following statement under the title "Capital Spotlight":

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Dr. Johnson, as I interpreted him in his sermon Sunday, made no qualification of his endorsement of communism. He went further than my story indicates. He spoke an hour and 10 minutes. I did not take in shorthand all that he said, but quit writing at times when he gave an illustration, and during some of these periods he made some of his strongest pronouncements on communism.

In corroboration of the newspaper report of this sermon, I quote an excerpt referring thereto which appears on pages 32 and 33 of Senate Document No. 217, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session:

Added to that difficulty there arises in the world in a country which has more than 150,000,000 population a new religion which comprehensively sets out to grasp economic, political, and family life and the effort of mankind in one

synthetic and powerful view. It is communism. It is based upon the determination to make economic and political institutions, the family life, and personal relations subject themselves and be ordered by this comprehensive belief that is thrust in the hands of the church.

In the western world we are afraid of that religion. We have sought to break it down by the use of armies. We have failed and refused to recognize the state brought to pass by that religion, and we are on guard lest by any means those beliefs shall generate into the body of our national life. But at the very moment when we are declaring from every American pulpit its destructive character, we are giving the world the most far-reaching political and economic corruption any nation has ever seen.

Is such faith possible? The very existence of communism indicates that it is. It is not necessary for a person to believe in communism as it is practiced in Russia today to be profoundly impressed with the marvelous synthesis of the great intellect and technology which guides these men. Their beliefs penetrate not only the individual life but penetrate and command the economic situation.

It is manifest in the United States that we shall not be able to resist the powerful impact of these religions upon the world life by a mere negative criticism of them. The only way to resist a great religion in which we do not believe is to produce and follow with a purity of heart a great religion in which we do believe. We are in process of formulating that religion in the United States. The fermentation of it is going on in the very midst of the churches; in the very midst of the institutions which are failing and know they are inadequate, there arises a ferment of thought that would grasp the whole range of modern life to inspire and rejuvenate the people in their great beliefs underlying our democratic society.

We must not allow the words "communism" and "socialism" to blind our eyes to the realization that on Russian soil today—it makes no difference what mistakes are being made or what crimes are being committed—there is a movement for the first time in the history of the world to make available the natural resources for the life of the common man.

I am in hearty sympathy with those who want to preserve our American system, but the preservation of our system is not the primary urgency. The primary urgency of life is to work out some way to use the scientific and technical resources of life for the emancipation of the people.

In the *New York Age*, the national Negro weekly, under the same date, June 10, 1933, we find the following editorial:

A QUESTION OF PROPRIETY

A subscriber of the *New York Age*, commenting on the editorial in last week's issue, "Dr. Johnson and Communism," writes:

"I have read with interest the most proper reference to the manifestly oratorical extreme of Dr. Johnson. One who is entrusted with grave and wide-reaching responsibilities needs to be more careful in what he shall say. It is well not only to put one's self in the other man's place but to try and recall the varying results on the mind of what goes into the ear of a mass of hearers.

"The right of Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson to embrace the communistic philosophy is not questioned. But those interested in the welfare of Howard University seriously question the propriety of the institution's president making public addresses which, if anything, impairs his usefulness. It is not because he fervently espouses the cause of communism that his performance on the lecture platform occasions apprehension. Were he to manifest similar activity on behalf of the Republican, Democratic, or Socialist Parties, criticism would be timely and pronounced.

"It may be pointed out that Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, discusses the political issues of the day with great zeal and frequency. But Columbia University does not depend on public funds for its maintenance. Without appropriations from Congress Howard University would either pass out of existence or fall from its high place as the largest institution of higher education in the world for young Negro men and women. As it is up to Congress to determine the extent of the Federal Government's largess toward the university, it would be good strategy for the administrative officers of Howard to make friends with Senators and Representatives—not enemies of them.

"No one can deny, of course, that there is a fundamental difference between communism and American politics. For communism means the absolute overthrow of our republican institutions.

"For Dr. Johnson to indulge in flights of oratory on communism before a New York audience might be considered a courageous and heroic thing to do by his friends and advisers, but there are times where discretion is the better part of valor."

Thereafter, in 1935, there was a conference at Howard University, which is described in an affidavit by Kelly Miller, Dean Emeritus of Howard University, which is set out as exhibit 1 on page 36 of Senate Document No. 217, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, on alleged communistic activities at Howard University:

EXHIBIT 1

CITY OF WASHINGTON,

District of Columbia:

On this 27th day of June 1935 personally appeared before me, a notary public in the District of Columbia, Kelly Miller, of Washington, D. C., who, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he is a graduate of Howard University and has been a professor and dean of the college at Howard University for 45 years, and at present is dean emeritus of said university.

That a conference on the economic condition of the Negro was held in Douglass Hall, Howard University, May 18, 19, 20, 1935. That he attended every session of this conference, and from the tenor of the opening he judged that the trend of the conference would be radical, leaning in the direction of communism, and he therefore queried the presiding officer as to whether it would be the purpose of the conference to keep the discussion within the framework of the Christian religion, democratic institutions, and the Constitution of the United States. He was informed that there was no such intention.

Deponent further avers that President Mordecai W. Johnson, of Howard University, was present at the time he made this query and had nothing to say.

That at the session on Sunday afternoon, May 19, the conference was addressed by Mr. W. B. Dubois and Professors Dorsey and Harris, of the university faculty; and that James W. Ford, vice presidential candidate on the Communist ticket during the last Presidential election, asked permission to speak, and that he announced the well-known principle of communism to bring about revolution by force. Professors Harris and Dorsey urged that the Negro should join with the forces of labor to bring about his salvation.

Deponent further avers that thereupon he arose and stated that the only components of the labor forces that are willing and ready to unite with the Negro are those of radical or communistic leanings, and that it would be suicidal for the Negro to ally himself with any force intent upon upsetting the Constitution and promoting revolution. In reply to these remarks two speakers passionately urged revolution through bloodshed, and one of them stated in vehement tones that without shedding blood there could be no remission of sin. Mr. Waldron, Washington correspondent of the Daily Worker, a communistic organ, stated not only once, but twice: "The revolution is coming notwithstanding the F. D. Roosevelts and the Kelly Millers."

President Johnson presided at this session and heard the discussion, but made no comments of any kind or character.

At the closing session on Monday afternoon, which was devoted to remedies for the Negro's economic condition, the listed speakers were Norman Thomas, candidate for the Presidency on the Socialist ticket; James W. Ford, and a Mr. McKinney, representative of the American Labor Party, which is perhaps the most radical of them all. His name was inserted in the original program. Each of these speakers gave the remedies proposed by his party, all of which suggestions were revolution, with and without the use of force. There was no speaker listed to represent the New Deal or the existing democratic order.

Deponent avers that he arose and stated that this seemed to be an unfair and one-sided arrangement, since only radicals were asked to give remedies and left no place for the conservatives and New Dealers. He was informed by the presiding officer that several such representatives had appeared on the program during the session and he deemed this sufficient to represent their point of view.

Deponent left the sessions with the feeling that the whole purpose and trend of the conference was to discredit existing institutions in favor of radicalism or some form of revolution.

KELLY MILLER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of June 1935.

SAMUEL E. LACY,
Notary Public.

My commission expires on the 10th day of July 1938.

On June 26, 1935, a memorandum was prepared by Lawrence A. Okley, of the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, which is found on page 54 of Senate Document No. 217, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, which reads as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS.
Washington, July 26, 1935.

Memorandum to Mr. Humphrey:

(Mr. Humphrey was the Government agent who was making an investigation at that time of the communistic activities at Howard University.)

It is my confirmed opinion that the national conference held at Howard University May 18, 19, and 20, under the auspices of the joint committee on national recovery and the social-science division of Howard University—having as its theme The Position of the Negro in our National Economic Crisis—was distinctly communistic in character.

The opinion offered in this statement is based on my personal attendance and observations of every session of the conference, beginning May 18 at 9:30 a. m., and closing May 20 at about 6 p. m.

With perhaps three or four exceptions, each speaker and discussant on the program seemed to be concerned first with making an attack on not only the present administration but American ideals and institutions. I believe that the last session of the conference is indicative of the trend and purpose of calling this meeting. Following the 3 days of speaking, discussions, and conferences, there seemed to be but "three ways out for the Negro." 1. The answer of the Socialist Party; 2. The answer of the Communist Party; 3. The answer of the American Labor Party"; Mr. McKinney.

With the exception of Mr. T. Burham King, the critical summaries of the conference were made by Mr. Reginald Johnson, Dr. Ralph Bunche, Mr. John P. Davis, and Mr. Emmett Dorsey. I believe that answers to the question, "What was the purpose of the conference?" are very well stated by a close study of the activities, utterances, and writings of the persons who made the critical summaries of the conference.

During the course of the last session, May 20, I heard Mr. Ford and Mr. Dorsey advocate the overthrow of the American Government, if necessary, to secure the objectives of the program sponsored by the conference.

(Signed) LAWRENCE A. OXLEY.

Mr. Ford is the colored gentleman who ran for the vice-presidency on the Communist ticket.

It would seem to me that the foregoing documents conclusively show that Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University, is administering that university adversely to the interests of the United States and of its taxpayers and citizens. Evidence has recently developed which corroborates this point of view.

It has been shown by a governmental investigation that Mordecai W. Johnson and other officers of Howard University have misappropriated funds which were furnished to the university and that Howard University was required to pay back, from its endowment, over 40 thousand dollars to the Government of the United States.

From these facts I am convinced that when an institution is the recipient of over \$600,000 annually of the taxpayers' money, and the head of that institution is endeavoring, through the advocacy of com-

munism, to destroy the very Government whose largess he is receiving, that the president of that institution should be separated from his high office.

May I say further that on being served with your subpoena I was doubtful of the propriety of my testifying before your committee. I so notified you, Mr. Chairman. But, realizing the importance of the disclosures which have been made by your investigation, I am willing to cooperate freely with your committee and to furnish it with facts which, in my opinion, have been suppressed by prominent officials of the Federal Government, and which, I feel, are essential to the success of your investigation.

By virtue of the position of Dr. Johnson, as president of Howard University, he occupies an office of such preeminence that he is able to influence and mold the thoughts and political views of the future leaders of the colored race. Since Howard University is an institution, largely supported and maintained by the Federal Government, this is not a private affair, but is or should be a matter of national interest.

I love this country of ours. I think that I am a patriot. I have been honored by my people as its representative in public office. I am deeply grateful for the honors bestowed upon me as the representative of my people. It is solely with the thought of guarding and protecting their well being and the security of the United States that I appear before your committee to protest the communistic teachings of Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, as president of Howard University.

The CHAIRMAN. You have referred to Senate Document No. 217, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, in your testimony. Please tell the committee what that document is.

Mr. COBB. This document relates to alleged communistic activities at Howard University, Washington, D. C., and was the result of an investigation conducted by Secretary Ickes, growing out of a conference which was held at Howard University for 3 days in May of 1935, to which I have previously referred in my testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you personally have a conference with Secretary Ickes as a result of this investigation?

Mr. COBB. I did.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell the committee in your own language just what conversation you had with Secretary Ickes.

Mr. COBB. I got a call from Secretary Ickes, through his secretary or someone in his office, to come to see him. As a result of that call, I went to see him.

He told me that they had been making an investigation at Howard University with respect to alleged communistic activities of the president of Howard University, and he wanted to know if I had any information that would be of help to him.

I told him that I knew the president and knew about his various utterances, that he lectured largely over the country, and for some unknown reason he always in those lectures brought in communism; that he spoke of it; that I had heard him on one occasion in a sermon say that communism was a religion. I said I had no evidence of the fact, but I had heard that the Communists had paid propagandists in the United States and I was inclined to think that he was one of those.

He asked me if I had any proof. I told him I had no proof except what I had heard with respect to that. But I did say to him that Howard University being a quasi-public institution, and the larger part of the moneys that were paid to the teachers and professors at Howard University being paid by the Federal Government, no one at the head of it should advocate or preach communism and that he, the Secretary had had an investigation made which would disclose to him more clearly the attitude of the president toward communism than anything I could say to him with regard to it.

The CHAIRMAN. You told him, in other words, that the Secretary himself had ordered an investigation and had secured all the facts with reference to communism at Howard University?

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What did he say after you said that?

Mr. COBB. He said that a lot of people were making charges against Dr. Johnson and other people, and that they came up there without any facts, and so forth; and he wanted facts. I said to him, "Why, Mr. Secretary, you have the facts here. You have had an investigation made and," I said, "an opinion has been given to you by your Solicitor to the effect that Howard University is a private institution and therefore it was doubtful whether or not you should go in there." I said, "I do not agree with that opinion as to the Government not going in there. They have a right to make an investigation anywhere, and especially at Howard University, since the Government is supporting Howard University and you are the head of Howard University ex-officio by the Government appropriations, and made so by the record."

He became rather impatient and said that it seemed that the people were fighting Dr. Johnson on account of personal grievances, and so forth, and that "You people come up here and make charges and you do not have anything to back them up."

I said, "Mr. Secretary, I came up here at your invitation. I did not invite myself up here. So far as I know, you did not know I was living. But," I said, "Mr. Secretary, you know very, very well that Dr. Johnson is not a proper person to be the head of Howard University; you have had an investigation made concerning a matter that is more detrimental and much more serious than the communistic investigation, which investigation discloses that Dr. Johnson has misappropriated funds, and that Howard University, out of its meager resources, its meager endowments, has had to pay back to the university more than \$40,000 for misappropriation of funds by Dr. Johnson; and that investigation was made by the Interior Department."

The CHAIRMAN. Did the Secretary say anything about Dr. Johnson being prominent in the Association for the Advancement of the Colored People, and that if he did anything about it, it might cost some votes?

Mr. COBB. No; he did not say that to me.

The CHAIRMAN. He did not say that to you?

Mr. COBB. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Judge, you mean that they had to pay back to the Government \$40,000; you said pay back to the university.

Mr. COBB. Yes; pay back to the Government \$40,000. After an investigation that was made by the Secretary and after a recommendation made here to the effect that Dr. Johnson and two other officers be removed—after stating that he says:

Your agents recommend that consideration be given to recommending that the board of trustees of Howard University consider the advisability of removing from office the president, treasurer, and superintendent of buildings and grounds, because of past irregularities, and to prevent the recurrence of the irregularities disclosed by this investigation.

Mr. MOSIER. Did Secretary Ickes recommend their removal?

Mr. COBB. He did.

Mr. MOSIER. But they were never removed?

Mr. COBB. No; he afterwards changed his mind.

Mr. MOSIER. He changed his mind?

Mr. COBB. Or his recommendation, anyway. He and I discussed it.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know why he changed his mind?

Mr. COBB. He said he had made an investigation and found out that Dr. Johnson, at the head of the university, could not be acquainted with all of the things that had gone on under him, and that he found out that others were responsible for the misuse of the funds.

I said to him, "Mr. Secretary, that is rather extraordinary, because you recommended, after the report had been made to you, that he be disassociated from the university;" and I said, "a further hearing showed that the treasurer and the superintendent of buildings and grounds were in no wise responsible for the expenditure of that money except according to the breakdown furnished by Dr. Johnson." I said, "Your own governmental agencies have shown, as disclosed by your investigation, that they furnished to Mr. Johnson the break-down for the expenditure of this money and that he made up one of his own and submitted the break-down and had it approved by the board of trustees, not knowing the Government had furnished a break-down, and furnished that to the superintendent of buildings and grounds and to the treasurer."

The CHAIRMAN. Who made this investigation by the Government?

Mr. COBB. The investigation was made under Mr. Glavis.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Mr. Glavis connected with the Government now?

Mr. COBB. He is not.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he fired shortly after that?

Mr. COBB. Mr. Glavis went out of the Department shortly after that. I talked to Mr. Glavis about this report. He asked me to see his covering letter, which I was unable to see. It was lost, for some reason or other. He further said that Dr. Johnson had seen him personally and he told him he knew nothing except what was given in this report, and he further said that he had, in investigations made by him, with less evidence than we had here, had people convicted and sent to the penitentiary.

Mr. MOSIER. In your conversation with Mr. Ickes, did he designate what facts he wanted you to produce, to prove to his own mind that Johnson was teaching communism?

Mr. COBB. No; he did not. As I said, he became short patiented, and he said that the President had called for him and he had to go over and see the President.

Mr. MOSIER. But he said that you people had not furnished facts?

Mr. COBB. That is what he said.

Mr. MOSIER. But a fact to you evidently was not a fact to Mr. Ickes?

Mr. COBB. Well, he told me he was a lawyer and he knew how to analyze testimony and evidence. I said, "I am, too, and," I said, "Mr. Secretary, take that document on communism, the investigation made by your Department, plus your investigation made by your Department of the misappropriation of funds. The bookkeeper himself swore that he was ordered to change the books of the university; also where some material was missing and it has not been disclosed and they have been trying to trace it and Dr. Johnson was responsible for it." I said, "As a judge who has been on the bench, I could place that document before any grand jury in the world and they would bring in an indictment." And I said, "If there were no better explanation made than is made in this report that you yourself have, I could convict him before any American jury in the country."

Mr. MOSIER. What I am trying to get at is, there were two grounds of complaint against Dr. Johnson, apparently. One was the misappropriation of funds.

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We are not really interested in that.

Mr. MOSIER. And the second was that he was teaching communism?

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, was Secretary Ickes interested in the teaching of communism as a ground of complaint, or was he interested in the other ground for removal?

Mr. COBB. I can only disclose what he said and his attitude. He asked me about communism. He did not ask me about this document at all.

The CHAIRMAN. When did this conference take place between you and Secretary Ickes?

Mr. COBB. It took place some time after this report was made on communism, after the investigation was made.

The CHAIRMAN. About what year was that?

Mr. COBB. 1936, as I remember now.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Johnson belongs to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, does he not?

Mr. COBB. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he a prominent official in it?

Mr. COBB. I do not know. He received the Spingarn medal. I was one of the directors of the organization for a long time myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Did that have anything to do with this failure to act on these charges that he was a Communist?

Mr. COBB. It would only be an inference on my part. I have no hesitancy in saying that I think it was political influence that—

The CHAIRMAN. We do not want your opinion. Did anyone in the Department tell you that?

Mr. COBB. No; no one in the Department told me that.

The CHAIRMAN. In your statement you testified that a Government investigation showed that Mordecai W. Johnson and other officers of Howard University had misappropriated funds which were furnished to the university by the Government of the United States, and that Howard University has been required to pay back,

from its endowment, over \$40,000 to the Government. I do not want that statement to go into the record unless you are in a position to sustain your testimony. Have you any evidence to support this statement?

Mr. COBB. Mr. Chairman, I think it is better for me to quote from the official document of the investigation made by the Interior Department, than to take any statement from me.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you let the committee have that, or do you want to keep that?

Mr. COBB. I have to keep it, but I am perfectly willing to let the chair have it, to go through it.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you quote from it and identify it?

Mr. COBB. I can. At the top it says: "Department of the Interior—Director of Investigations—Washington."

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of the report?

Mr. COBB. October 5, 1934. Then it goes on with "Period of Investigation: August 10 to October 5, 1934."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any summary of the report?

Mr. COBB. This is not the whole report; this is a summary itself. The report is a very voluminous document.

The CHAIRMAN. That is Glavis' report; is it?

Mr. COBB. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that ever printed by the Government?

Mr. COBB. This report was gotten out and a copy was furnished to the chairman of the board of trustees of Howard University, and subsequently thereto, one of the other members of the board of trustees got hold of the report and had it made up in this fashion.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you some short extracts that you can read from the report to be included with your statement in the record?

Mr. COBB. Here is a recommendation that I will read:

Your agents recommend that Howard University be directed to reimburse P. W. A. in the amount of \$29,622.55 for overexpenditures on Federal projects Nos. 1, 7, 8, 12, 18, 23, 24, 30, and 31. Also that the University be directed to pay employees amounts deducted from their wages, also the difference between wages paid and the minimum P. W. A. wage rates, during the period August 16, 1933, to July 31, 1934. Your agents recommend that consideration be given to recommending that the board of trustees of Howard University considered the advisability of removing from office the president, treasurer, and superintendent of buildings and grounds, because of past irregularities and to prevent a recurrence of the irregularities disclosed by this investigation.

That is the recommendation.

On page 6 of this report there is another recommendation. It says this:

I have received the adverse report of Special Agent Belue, dated June 28, covering the investigation of irregularities at Howard University. It is noted that a quantity of lumber disappeared mysteriously in the summer of 1932 and that the bookkeeper in the department of maintenance has admitted receiving instructions to make false entries in his books of account.

Special Agent Belue in his report, DC 0109-PW, stated:

In view of the affidavit of the bookkeeper that he he was instructed to change his books, and in view of the fact that the treasurer of Howard University in a letter of May 21, enclosing a check for \$3,903.38, admitted that the Howard University had misused funds appropriated for other specific purposes, agent recommends that a thorough and exhaustive audit be made of the books of Howard University.

The CHAIRMAN. When you had this conference with the Secretary, did you talk to him or discuss the facts about Dr. Johnson's communistic speeches? Did he know about the speeches and sermons delivered by Dr. Johnson?

Mr. COBB. This report was made—may I answer in this way?—this report was made at the instance, I would say, of Secretary Ickes, because he is the head of the Interior Department. This report was in the Interior Department. It subsequently was not published. It was not acted upon, as I understand from the Solicitor to the Secretary, because Howard University was a private institution and not a Government institution.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what was in that report?

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir; I have the report here.

The CHAIRMAN. What did the report show? Did it show that Dr. Johnson had been preaching communism?

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the report set forth the various speeches that he made?

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir; Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you quoted from that report in your statement?

Mr. COBB. I have quoted from the report. Most of the statements that I have made have been made from that report.

The CHAIRMAN. So that the Secretary had before him that report.

Mr. COBB. I will not say that. May I read from this report of the Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, Senate Document No. 217?

The CHAIRMAN. How did you get that report?

Mr. COBB. It was given to me by a United States Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a public document?

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How was it published? Did you say it was published?

Mr. COBB. I said it was published. The report was published as a Senate document, but the Interior Department never did anything about it. As I understand it, the Secretary said it was the duty of the trustees of the board to act, as it was a private institution.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that report?

Mr. COBB. Do you want me to identify it?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; identify it.

Mr. COBB. The title of the report is as follows:

Alleged Communistic Activities at Howard University, Washington, D. C. Letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior transmitting in response to Senate Resolution No. 294, photostatic copies of reports, made by a special agent of the Division of Investigations on September 23 and 30, 1935, together with memorandums from the Director of Investigations, and Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

May 12 (calendar day, May 15), 1936.—Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Following that—

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, May 14, 1936.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

Sir: Pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 294 of April 30, I am transmitting herewith photostatic copies of reports made by a special agent of the Division

of Investigations on September 23 and 30, 1935, memorandums dated September 25, October 3 and 24, from the Director of Investigations, and a memorandum of October 17 from the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, all pertaining to alleged communistic activities at Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES WEST,

Acting Secretary of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. In this conversation with Secretary Ickes, you say you called his attention to the fact that the Secretary himself had ordered the investigation.

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And then, after that investigation, he refused to act in the matter: Did you call his attention to that?

Mr. COBB. I want to be accurate in my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; we want you to be accurate.

Mr. COBB. I told him that his investigation disclosed more convincingly and more thoroughly than anything I had said that Dr. Johnson was, if not a Communist, I would say he was communistic, or certainly was preaching Communist doctrines; that he should not be doing that; that Howard University was a Government institution, and that young men and women of impressionable minds were going there. I said they would fall more quickly to those teachings and preachments than anybody else would. I further said that it was most unfortunate. I wish I could be clearly understood. I have been personally into this thing, and I said that it is most unfortunate to my own people and most unfortunate to the Government, because I said that it is a seeping thing; that revolutions do not happen in a day, a week, or a month, but that they grow and grow. I said that the people, and especially the good white people of this country say that the colored people are the most patriotic people in the world; that they believe in the Government. I said that they do believe in the Government, but, I said, "Don't you know that they are like other people?" Now, you take a colored man from some school, and he speaks well and has a good address. He says, "Here, if you go with me, if you travel with me, if you belong to our organization, all of us will be one."

The CHAIRMAN. What did he say about communism, in response to what you said?

Mr. COBB. As I have said, he became short of patience, and he said that they came there with loose statements and no proof. I said to him, "There cannot be any clearer proof than what a man says and what he does." I said, "He is the president of Howard University, and these are public speeches; he makes lectures from the platform, and he delivers baccalaureate sermons to the students." You cannot get better evidence to disclose what a man is doing. I do not know whether he belongs to a Communist society or organization. I do not think he has ever been to Russia.

Mr. MOSIER. You were on the bench for many years.

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir; for 10 years lacking 3 months.

Mr. MOSIER. And while on the bench, you tried a great many lawsuits.

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You had to consider at all times what was to be taken as evidence or proof, and you come here today with the proof

you have offered us, which looks to me rather convincing. How long did you talk with Mr. Ickes on that occasion?

Mr. COBB. I talked with him long enough to travel over what I have already said here. Then Mr. Ickes got a flash and said the President had called him and he had to go.

Mr. MOSIER. Were you with him about half an hour?

Mr. COBB. No, sir; not half an hour, but about 10 or 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he say in that conversation that they were always trying to brand liberals as Communists?

Mr. COBB. He said something to that effect, about liberalism, and that I ought to be liberal. I told him that I thought I was a very great liberal, but that I was not liberal to the extent of preaching the doctrine of overthrowing the Government. He said, "Of course not." He said very definitely that he did not believe in any such thing himself.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge, we appreciate your appearance, even though you were subpoenaed. Now, can you briefly tell us whether, or not, there is a definite effort being made to spread communism among the Negroes throughout the country?

Mr. COBB. I think so, personally.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know it?

Mr. COBB. I can say this, that I spoke in Baltimore in 1936, and from the same platform Mr. Elmer Carter spoke. It was a political speech. He spoke for the Democratic Party and I spoke for the Republican Party. They had colored men—there were white and colored men. Mr. Scott spoke also. There were Communists there, and they heckled me and put questions to me. It was in a church, and the church was full.

The CHAIRMAN. How many people attended that meeting in Baltimore?

Mr. COBB. It was a large church, and the church was filled.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they applaud the Communist who spoke on behalf of that organization?

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And they heckled you?

Mr. COBB. I was applauded and heckled, too. There was a large number of Communists there.

The CHAIRMAN. What other evidence do you have of the spread of Communism among colored people?

Mr. COBB. I have seen it from several sources, from meetings where they are talking it or discussing it.

The CHAIRMAN. You have heard it discussed among your people at various meetings?

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir; I have heard it discussed at many meetings. For instance, I was at Luray, Va., I think, in April or May. I spoke at the Courthouse at Luray, Va. There were a number of people there. A white gentleman came over there and presided at the meeting. The judge of the court presided at the meeting. I was introduced by Mr. Lucas, a white lawyer. They had me come up there and speak at the courthouse. There were white men up there. They said that Mr. Ford was up there discussing communism with them. There were a number of colored people there also, and a great many of them took part in it. That is something that naturally

appeals to them. If you go to them and tell them about that doctrine, you will see that they are as ambitious as anybody else. If you tell young people that every opportunity is open to them in this society, and preach to them that they will go up, it naturally appeals to them. As I have been saying, I have been trying everywhere to make the plea that it was a most dangerous thing to do; that it was a dangerous thing for any minority to do, especially our colored people. However, you will find it very prevalent and very prominent all over the country—much more so than I think is good for the colored people or white people. They realize and recognize that fact.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it more prevalent in cities among colored people than in the country?

Mr. COBB. Undoubtedly so.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you found it in Baltimore.

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In what other places have you found it?

Mr. COBB. I have found it in every city I have gone to. I have heard it discussed recently. I made a trip through Texas, visiting Fort Worth, Dallas, and Galveston, and, also, New Orleans and Shreveport, La. I can say that I do not think it is as prevalent in the South as you find it in the North.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not as prevalent in the South as you find it in the North.

Mr. COBB. I do not think it is.

The CHAIRMAN. How about Harlem, in New York? Do they discuss it?

Mr. COBB. They discuss everything at Harlem. As you know, they have soap-box orators there, and I think Mr. Ford lives in Harlem. He is very attractive in his speech.

The CHAIRMAN. He ran for vice president.

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir. Then there is Angelo Herndon, who was convicted and sentenced under an old statute that the Supreme Court threw out. He was preaching it in Georgia, and they put him in jail. He is a young man, and a very attractive talker. He makes a good impression among young people, but, to my mind, it is all very foolish and silly. The young people are easily impressed with it. They think of the immediacy of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. In these Communist meetings where you have been, do you find that the audiences are mixed, of white and colored people?

Mr. COBB. They are very definitely mixed. At Baltimore, there were a number of whites. I recall that there were a number of whites at the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Were there more colored people than white present?

Mr. COBB. I think there were more colored people than white people, because it was a colored meeting. It was, however, very definitely mixed.

The CHAIRMAN. Going back a second to this report, as I understand your testimony, at the Secretary's instance and request, this investigation was made of communism in Howard University, and he designated Mr. Glavis to conduct the investigation.

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. He designated him to make the investigation, and Mr. Glavis made the investigation, but after he made it, it was suppressed.

Mr. COBB. The report was never published other than in this document, and I would say that nothing has been said about it. I saw this report. The Interior Department took the position that Howard University was a private concern. They said they took that position. I said that I thought it was unfortunate. I thought the Government had a right to make it public.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they explain why the investigation was made in the first place?

Mr. COBB. That is what I could not understand—why make the investigation in the first place, and then after making the investigation, not acting on it.

Mr. MOSIER. They claimed it was on the ground that it was a private institution.

Mr. COBB. That was the alleged reason why it was not acted upon.

Mr. MOSIER. You having been a judge, I believe, and, coming within the category of an expert, and, therefore, able to give an expert opinion to this committee, after your conversation with them in regard to the making of this investigation and report, what, in your opinion, was the real reason for not following out the recommendations contained in the report?

Mr. COBB. My private opinion is that it was politics. It was political.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you mean?

Mr. COBB. I mean that Dr. Johnson, the president of Howard University, was of sufficient political influence in his connections that he had it stopped.

The CHAIRMAN. Through what organization?

Mr. COBB. I think he had it done through his influence with a number of organizations, political parties, organizations like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and others. That is my inference.

The CHAIRMAN. You were a director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, were you not?

Mr. COBB. I was a director.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not connected with Howard University now?

Mr. COBB. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did not the report of Mr. Glavis recommend that Johnson and some other teachers be discharged?

Mr. COBB. No, sir; this report does not.

The CHAIRMAN. It did not recommend it?

Mr. COBB. No, sir; not in this report. A report was made about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Glavis' report recommended it, did it not?

Mr. COBB. The newspapers reported that Mr. Glavis in the campaign of 1936 was talking about making a special report on something for the President. To follow him up, I personally talked to Mr. Glavis, but he did not tell me why he was out of the Government. I gathered from him that he was simply disappointed that this report was not made public. He also said he made another report. I

do not know anything about it. I do not know what that report was.

The CHAIRMAN. In order to straighten it out, the Glavis report was never made public by any Government bureau.

Mr. COBB. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. It was sent to the trustees of Howard University.

Mr. COBB. I know that this report was sent in, and the chairman tried to keep this report from going to all the trustees of Howard University, because I have a letter here saying so.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a letter saying that they did not want to send it to all the trustees.

Mr. COBB. I have a letter where one of the trustees was protesting that the report did not come to him. He had to go to somebody else to get it. He got it from Mr. Glavis.

The CHAIRMAN. It did not have Mr. Glavis' covering letter.

Mr. COBB. Mr. Glavis' covering letter, I understand, went to the Secretary. Subsequently thereto, Mr. Glavis suggested that they go to the covering letter to see what he recommended. They sought to get the covering letter. They went to Mr. Halstead, in the Senate. They made a search in the Interior Department, and said they could not find it. They said they could not find it among the Senate documents.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know where Mr. Glavis is now?

Mr. COBB. I understand he is in Alaska, or somewhere out there. He was here on the confirmation of one of the Secretaries of the Interior. Senator Pittman had him before the committee. He referred to this document, and he said he recommended that Dr. Johnson be dismissed.

The CHAIRMAN. The other report about communism was published by the Senate.

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But it was not published by the Interior Department.

Mr. COBB. I think that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that report available to the Interior Department at the time of your conversation with Secretary Ickes?

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir; because the report was made to the Interior Department.

The CHAIRMAN. That report sets forth the facts about Dr. Johnson's advocacy of communism.

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir; this report sets it forth in more detail than I have the time to do.

The CHAIRMAN. So full information was available to the Interior Department about the communistic activities of Dr. Johnson.

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But, notwithstanding that, no action has been taken.

Mr. COBB. None that I know of.

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. Glavis made a report recommending that Dr. Johnson be fired.

Mr. COBB. He stated in the hearing before the committee that he recommended that he be discharged from Howard University.

Mr. MOSIER. And Glavis made that recommendation to the Secretary.

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And he made the same recommendation.

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. But nothing was done about it. In other words, somebody somewhere along the line changed somebody's mind.

The CHAIRMAN. Did someone tell you why they did not do it?

Mr. COBB. I can say this, Mr. Chairman, that personally I do not know.

Mr. MOSIER. You testify to that as your opinion.

Mr. COBB. I can say, Mr. Chairman, that I was following it up, so far as that was concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. We will adjourn now until 10:30 Monday morning.

(Thereupon, the subcommittee adjourned to meet Monday, November 7, 1938, at 10:30 a. m.)



INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1938

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO
INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman), presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Matthews, you were sworn upon your previous appearance before the committee, but I will swear you again at this time.

(The witness was sworn by the chairman.)

TESTIMONY OF J. B. MATTHEWS—Resumed

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Matthews, you testified before this committee some time in September, did you not?

Mr. MATTHEWS. In August.

The CHAIRMAN. At present, what is your business?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am an independent writer.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a graduate of any college or educational institution.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir; several.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you name them?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Asbury College, Kentucky; Columbia University; Drew University; Union Theological Seminary; and the University of Vienna.

The CHAIRMAN. You testified before that you helped organize the League Against War and Fascism.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I did.

The CHAIRMAN. You were the first national chairman of that league?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. You also assisted in the organization of some 20 or 25 organizations of the Communist Party, did you not?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir; to be exact, there were 28.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-eight front organizations that you helped organize?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Not exactly organize, no; I was either officially connected with or in some other way worked on behalf of 28 organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. Before we come to those organizations I want you to read from the Daily Worker, which is one of the official papers of the Communist Party, various mentions of you during all the time

you were active in the movement, so that the record will identify, through the Daily Worker, your own activities.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have here some samples of comments made in the Daily Worker on various occasions when I addressed Communist united front meetings.

The first one is in the Daily Worker of February 27, 1935, on page 4. This is from a special feature article signed by Simon W. Gerson, who this year was appointed assistant borough president of Manhattan, and whose appointment created considerable excitement, in view of the fact that he was well known as a Communist.

Mr. Gerson said:

The crowd went wild at the mention of the need for the united front by Matthews. * * * It seemed that the very steel girders that arched across the roof would bend from the ear-splitting cheers that went up. * * * The applause was positively deafening.

The Daily Worker stated that there were 22,000 persons in Madison Square Garden, with an overflow meeting with 20,000 outside listening through amplifiers.

In the Daily Worker of April 15, 1933, on page 1, it is stated:

J. B. Matthews struck the keynote of the demonstration.

This referred to one of my speeches in Union Square under the auspices of the International Labor Defense. Twenty thousand persons were said to be present. I underscore "were said to be present," because of the peculiar characteristic of Communist mathematics, which is quite customary to exaggerate the form of that exact science.

In the Daily Worker of April 7, 1933, on page 4, it was said:

J. B. Matthews made a trenchant attack upon the illusion of bourgeois democracy prevalent among the intelligensia.

This referred to a speech which I also made in Madison Square Garden, at which 22,000 were said to be present.

In the Daily Worker of June 1, 1933, on page 1, there was this statement:

Among the prominent speakers will be J. B. Matthews.

This referred to a meeting of the Friends of the Chinese People in Irving Plaza, in New York.

In the Daily Worker of February 27, 1935, on page 2, it was stated:

J. B. Matthews roused the extraordinary feeling of solidarity which pervaded the meeting to an immense pitch. An extraordinary wave of feeling and enthusiasm swept over the meeting, with thousands of workers rising to their feet cheering.

In the Daily Worker of March 30, 1935, it was stated:

Congressman Ernest Lundeen and J. B. Matthews will be among the principal speakers at this meeting.

This referred to a mass meeting of the Friends of the Soviet Union in Milwaukee, Wis.

In the Daily Worker of May 24, 1935, on page 2, it was stated:

J. B. Matthews, a leading revolutionary socialist, was greeted with thunderous cheers.

This was at a meeting of "Icor," in the New York Hippodrome, with 4,000 said to be present.

I have here a letter from the Communist head of the Canadian League Against War and Fascism, whom I knew for some years in various capacities.

I omitted to testify in my previous appearance here that I had had some part in the Canadian League Against War and Fascism as well as in that of the American League Against War and Fascism.

In one of these letters the head of the Canadian League Against War and Fascism said:

Sunday evening we are going to stage a mass meeting in Massey Hall, which holds 3,500 people. It is absolutely imperative that you remain over for this, for we shall have to build the meeting around you and your world-wide reputation. We will do our damndest to arrange a polite deportation for you.

I have a telegram from the Communist leaders of the Free Tom Mooney Congress, held in Chicago, in 1933, which says:

Leading Congress committee members unanimously agree further united action of working class would be enormously strengthened by your presence here.

I also have here a letter from the speakers' bureau of the American League Against War and Fascism, which says:

We know we are risking being thrown right out of your office and onto the cold hard pavement outside. But we are willing to risk life and limb to clear up some of these pathetic pleas for J. B. Matthews. * * * The application for speaker ends this wise: "We must have J. B. Matthews."

The CHAIRMAN. I think you have read enough from the various editions of the Daily Worker to identify yourself throughout that period with the front movements.

Mr. MATTHEWS. May I say, Mr. Congressman, I went to the trouble of counting the number of times my name appeared with favorable mention in the Daily Worker in a single year, and it was 183.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you helped organize, or were identified as an official with, 28 of the front organizations of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. How long were you engaged in that work?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The first of those united front activities took place at the end of 1932, and these activities continued until the fall of 1935.

The CHAIRMAN. You stated at the last hearing why you severed your connection with the Communist front organizations and with the movement. Could you again, briefly, give us that so that we can pick up from where we left off?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think I stated that the getting into the Communist united-front activities was a slow process, extending over a period of years, and getting out of those activities was likewise a slow process, extending over a period of something like 2 years.

The principal reason for my severing connections with the Communist united-front activities was that I found myself unable, conscientiously, to participate in acts and policies which were required of those who worked with the Communists. In other words, I experienced what might be called an ethical revulsion against the Communist movement.

The CHAIRMAN. Now we have the background, first, from the Communist Daily Worker, with numerous mentions throughout a long

period of time, complimentary of your work, and we have you giving your reasons for having severed that connection.

After you left the stand, in your former appearance before the committee, when you testified under oath, Mr. Broun challenged your statement and denied that he once told you "that he was resigning from the Socialist Party in order to have greater freedom and greater opportunity to work with the Communist Party." Have you any additional testimony to offer on this line?

Mr. MATTHEWS Yes. At the time I testified previously I was not aware of the fact that Mr. Broun had discussed his resignation from the Socialist Party in his own column in the Scripps-Howard newspapers. It occurred to me, however, that it would be worth while looking up the files of the New York World-Telegram to see if Mr. Broun had made mention of his resignation.

I discovered that on April 29, 1933, in the World Telegram, on page 11, in his column entitled, "It Seems to Me," he had discussed the incident of his resignation from the Socialist Party in considerable detail, and to my mind verified completely what I said regarding his resignation.

Among other things, he said:

In getting out of the Socialist Party one should leave by the door to the left.

I take it that is plain enough, that in Mr. Broun's own mind he was not resigning from the Socialist Party in order to become more rightist in his politics, but on the contrary, to become more leftist.

He went on to corroborate in detail my statement that he and I were both under fire in the Socialist Party on account of our united-front activities with the Communists. In this column he even refers to me, although not by name. He states that he had received a letter from the executive secretary of the Socialist Party threatening him with disciplinary action if he persisted in his Communist united-front activities, and that he was also informed by the secretary of the Socialist Party in this communication that one comrade was already under charges. Let me give you the exact words for that:

One comrade had already been called up on charges for a similar offense.

That reference is to me, because I have verified from the records of the Socialist Party that I was the only other individual in the Socialist Party under charges at that time, and I have here, Mr. Chairman, a copy of the letter from the Socialist Party, signed by the same executive secretary, dated April 17, 1933, notifying me that charges had been preferred against me for participating in Communist united-front activities.

I have provided for the record documentary evidence of the fact that Mr. Broun and I were closely associated in at least five united fronts at this time, and I can say that can be brought out from our personal connections, and if I may be permitted to make a deduction I would say it was not unreasonable that Mr. Broun would inform me of his intention to resign from the Socialist Party. I do know that it was about 8:30 o'clock on the evening of April 28, 1933, in the Rand School of Social Science, that Mr. Broun told me about his intention to resign, and his reasons therefor.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you give us the names of the Communist-front organizations that you and Mr. Broun were connected with?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The National Student League, in its demonstrations at City College and Columbia University.

The National Committee to Aid the Victims of German Fascism, and the documentary evidence for that is in the Daily Worker of May 12, 1933, on page 4.

On that page of the Daily Worker there is published a letter signed by myself, addressed to District Attorney Thomas C. T. Crain, of New York. The district attorney's office had raided this communistic united-front organization, of which I was treasurer, and of which Mr. Broun was a national committeeman. In my letter I said:

Well-known citizens, such as George Soule, of the New Republic; Heywood Broun, of the New York World-Telegram; and Roger Baldwin and others are included in that committee.

There was also the National Scottsboro Committee of Action, the evidence for which is in the Daily Worker of May 3, 1933, on page 2; Broun and I are listed as national committeemen.

There was also the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners, the evidence for which is in the Daily Worker of March 18, 1935, on page 4.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not mention the National Mooney Council of Action.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I skipped that accidentally. I was corresponding secretary of the National Mooney Council of Action, and Heywood Broun was national committeeman.

The CHAIRMAN. What documentary evidence do you have for that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The evidence for that is found in the Daily Worker of May 12, 1933, on page 2.

I think it was significant that on December 16, 1936, a mass meeting for Harry Bridges was staged in Madison Square Garden. The speakers on that occasion were Harry Bridges, Joseph Curran, Ben Gold, Vito Marcantonio, Clayton Powell, Louis Weinstock, and Heywood Broun. Every one of these persons is a well-known Communist Party member or a fellow traveler.

In the current issue of The Nation, dated November 5, 1938, Mr. Paul Y. Anderson discusses Mr. Broun's testimony before this committee in which he denied my statements, and Mr. Anderson says that Heywood Broun was "cut off in the middle of his second sentence when he tried to testify before" this committee. That is found on page 472 of this issue of The Nation.

The stenographic record shows that Mr. Broun completed 10 sentences.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, Mr. Broun submitted a statement in writing to the chairman, and the chairman requested the entire committee to let him read the statement, and we did let him read his statement as furnished to us before he testified.

You testified that Harry Bridges was a member of the Communist Party and that no special pains were taken to conceal this in former years. Have you any evidence to offer on that question?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This, Congressman, was aside from the fact that Harry Bridges and his work for the Communist Party were discussed a number of times in my presence during the period when I was in the Communist united-front activities, and I have here the evidence

in *The Communist*, which is the official monthly organ of the Communist Party, dated November 1934.

In this Communist publication, there is an article entitled, "Our Trade Union Policy," by Jack Stachel.

John Stachel is the generalissimo of all trade-union matters in the Communist Party, and what he says may be taken as authoritative from the standpoint of the party.

In discussing the general strike of 1934 in San Francisco, Mr. Stachel said:

The San Francisco strike proves that it is not only possible for the Communists to organize and lead struggles in the A. F. of L. unions but that it is possible to win the struggles.

Then, concluding his discussion of the general strike in San Francisco, Mr. Stachel went on to say:

What will happen if the workers elect not only one Bridges but hundreds of Bridges in the section and district leadership, not to speak of national leadership? There will be big struggles. The workers will be revolutionized.

That is about as explicit a public announcement of Harry Bridges' membership in the Communist Party as could be made in a party publication.

A statement to the effect that the workers will become revolutionized under the leadership of Harry Bridges, and that the Communist Party itself organized and led the general strike of San Francisco under Bridges' leadership both constitute, in my mind, clear proof of Mr. Bridges' membership in the party.

The CHAIRMAN. In your former testimony, you gave us a summary of the 28 Communist united-front organizations with which you have been an official and otherwise connected.

In order to have a complete record of your united-front activities, can you give us a full list?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have found that there were, to be exact, 28 Communist united-front organizations with which I was connected in one way or another. They included the Student Congress Against War, with which I was not only connected but a member of the national committee. Here is a photostat copy of a list of the national committee and the Congress' program [indicating].

The CHAIRMAN. Does it carry your name also?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The national committee for the Student Congress Against War lists my name among others, including Corliss Lamont, Donald Henderson, and half a dozen others.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us have the next one.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The National Student League. I was a speaker on numerous occasions, and at least half a dozen of those occasions were reported in the *Daily Worker*.

The American Student Union, established through a merger of the National Student League and the Student League for Industrial Democracy; that record will be in the file of the League for Industrial Democracy, of which I was a director at the time of that vote.

The next is the unemployed councils. I worked with them to get together and form what became the Workers' Alliance. The evidence for that is in the report of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, which I have here. The Communist Party mass—

The CHAIRMAN. Are you reading from that particular document?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I am stating the documentary evidence for these connections.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Communist Party Mass Meeting on Fascism on April 5, 1933, in Madison Square Garden. I have already cited the reference in the Daily Worker as to that meeting.

The next is the International Labor Defense. I was a speaker at one of its mass meetings in Union Square.

The next is the Free Tom Mooney Congress. I was officially made a member of its presiding committee.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean you were officially connected with it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I was.

The next is the National Tom Mooney Council of Action. I was officially connected with that as its corresponding secretary.

The next is the National Scottsboro Committee of Action. I was officially connected with that as a member of its executive committee.

The next is the National Committee to Aid the Victims of German Fascism. I was officially connected with that as treasurer.

The next is the International Committee to Aid Victims of German Fascism. I was officially connected with that as one of the six American representatives. The others included A. J. Muste, George Soule, H. W. Dana, Alfred Wagenknecht, and John Dos Passos.

The Federated Press; for 2 years I held one of its press cards.

Then there was the Teachers Anti-War Conference. I was a speaker for this organization, along with Arthur Garfield Hays. That meeting is recorded in this bulletin, The Struggle Against War, of June 1933, page 2.

Then there was the Anti-Imperialist League. I was officially connected as a member of its delegation to Cuba. This is reported in the Daily Worker.

Then there is the American Friends of the Chinese People. I was a speaker, and I have already cited the Daily Worker reference to this meeting.

Then there was the American Committee for the Struggle Against War. I was officially connected as a member of its national committee. The evidence for that is in this same bulletin entitled "The Struggle Against War," and my going on this national committee is the subject of a special news item in this bulletin entitled "American Committee for the Struggle Against War Gains Important Members." J. B. Matthews, executive secretary, Fellowship of Reconciliation, and Dorothy Detzer, executive secretary, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Miss Detzer and I were the two members shown in connection with the National Organizing Committee for the First United States Congress Against War.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the parent organization, and then it grew into the League Against War and Fascism, and the next step was the League for Peace and Freedom; is that correct?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct. They listed them separately, but the Communists controlled them in each case.

The CHAIRMAN. You have an official document of the Communist Party including a graph or chart of the evolution of the League for Peace and Freedom?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. We will come to that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I was officially connected with the national organizing committee, which I have named, as its chairman. That, too, is reported in the Daily Worker.

The next is the United States Congress Against War. I was officially connected with that as its chairman.

Then there is the American League Against War and Fascism. I was officially connected with that as the chairman of that body.

The CHAIRMAN. What evidence do you have to show that you were the chairman of the League Against War and Fascism?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have numerous flyers, letterheads of the organization, and references in the Daily Worker, to my being the national chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Committee for investigating union disputes in the fur industry: I was officially connected as one of the investigators.

Friends of the Soviet Union: I was officially connected as a member of its national committee.

The CHAIRMAN. You have documents supporting that, such as you have with reference to the others?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Both of those organizations are reported in the Daily Worker with my name as a member.

Columbia Anti-War Committee: I was connected as a speaker, along with Earl Browder and that meeting is reported in the Daily Worker.

Book union: I was officially connected as a member of the national sponsors committee. The evidence for that is in the literature of the book union itself.

National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners: A speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. You were a speaker?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I was a speaker.

Icor: I was a speaker for it.

Labor Sports Union: I was an endorser with a solicited testimonial for this subsidiary organization of the Red Sports International.

League of Women Shoppers: I was consulted frequently during the formation of this Communist united front.

Canadian League Against War and Fascism: I was a speaker, as I have already indicated, from letters from the chairman of the Canadian League.

The tabulation which I have presented indicates that I was officially connected with 15 of these 28 organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. You were officially connected with 15 of the 28 organizations?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct. A recent examination of my files and those of the Daily Worker showed that I made at least 106 speeches for these united front organizations, and my own files show that I declined, under pressure of other duties, many times that number of invitations to speak on behalf of these united fronts.

To the best of my ability I have tried to make an accounting of moneys which I have received for this activity over a period of 3 years. I find I received \$380 toward my traveling expenses, and they were, of course, several times that amount. I never received a cent of salary from any one of them, but I did receive a check of \$10 as an

honorarium. That check is still in my possession. There it is, Mr. Congressman, from the Friends of the Soviet Union [indicating check].

Two things, it seemed to me, should be obvious: First, that I was deeply engrossed with the cause; and second, that I ought to know a Communist united-front maneuver when I see one.

In my previous testimony I stated that Robert Morss Lovett of the University of Chicago had participated more actively in Communist united fronts than I during this period. I discovered that that is not correct. Robert Morss Lovett's record is not within miles of my own. There was no one else in the United States whose record begins to compare even slightly with my own united front activities during this period.

I recall that when I demurred in the matter of becoming chairman of the American League Against War and Fascism, both Earl Browder and Donald Henderson assured me that there was no second choice under consideration. I was the logical, the absolutely inevitable choice for that position at the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Matthews, I understand that Earl Browder said, after your appearance here in August, that you were a secretary for the American League Against War and Fascism. He made no mention of your having been the first national chairman of the organization. Speaking of you, in a speech published in the Daily Worker, August 27, 1938, Browder said:

When he was hired as secretary by the American League it was not at Communist initiative and when he was fired the same thing was true.

Were you ever hired or fired as secretary of the American league?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No, Mr. Congressman, nor as anything else.

I have here a clipping from the Daily Worker of March 26, 1934, which contains an article written by Earl Browder himself. He says, among other things:

During this period some Socialists actively participated in the work of the central leadership, notably J. B. Matthews, chairman.

I simply call your attention to what Earl Browder now says about my having been hired and fired as secretary of the American League, because it illustrates a very common tactic of the Communist Party in dealing with the testimony of anyone who has ever been closely associated with its activities and then renounces communism. The effort, of course, is to minimize so far as possible the importance of the individual who has deserted. And that I think is the only possible way of accounting for Mr. Browder's present statement that I was hired and fired as secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. Did your Communist united-front activities bring you into personal contact with Earl Browder, and if so will you give the committee any documentary evidence you have in that connection?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, Congressman: on many occasions it was necessary for me to consult with Mr. Browder and for him to consult with me over these activities. The almost invariable rule was that I went to Browder's office on Twelfth Street in New York for these consultations.

But I discovered since I appeared before your committee in August, some documents which indicate a deviation from that almost invariable rule.

On November 1, 1933, I received a telegram signed "Pass," which refers to Joseph Pass who was the editor and is now of Fight magazine, the publication of the American League for Peace and Democracy. In this telegram Pass says:

Can you meet Browder this afternoon to go over magazine material? Phone me for appointment.

Simultaneously on the same date and on the letterhead of the United States Congress against War, Joseph Pass over his own signature wrote me a letter which says:

DEAR J. B.: In reference to the N. R. A. article it is agreed that we should follow your proposals. I am cutting and changing the galleys and will send you the proof as soon as it comes back.

There are several things I should like to point out with reference to these two communications coming from Pass on the same day. It was customary for us to use the telephone in these matters. It was also the invariable rule, with this exception, that when Browder and I wished to get in touch with each other, we called each other directly. We did not use an intermediary.

You will notice Joseph Pass asks me to phone him for the appointment with Browder. I made the appointment and met Browder, not at his office—and this was the only occasion when I did not meet him at his office in such a consultation—but at Stewart's Cafeteria on Seventh Avenue just below Fourteenth Street in New York, about 3 o'clock on November 1, 1933.

Almost the first thing Browder said to me when I met him was, "I suppose you wondered why that telegram from Pass. It was just to make a record of what I do not wish to talk to you about."

Browder explained to me then and on other occasions that he believed his office telephone was tapped and he therefor asked Pass to make this appointment with me so that no telephone call between my office and his would be a matter of record on this particular occasion.

Well, the business about which Mr. Browder wished to see me dealt with the possibility of my making a contact in the Department of State here in Washington for the Community Party, with a view to the party's using in some way the processes of diplomatic immunity to transfer funds from Russia to the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN. Did you know a Communist in the Department of State?

MR. MATTHEWS. I had lived in Washington for 1 year in 1928 and I did know one of the younger men on the Department of State staff who was a Communist.

THE CHAIRMAN. Who was that man?

MR. MATTHEWS. Noel Field.

THE CHAIRMAN. Is he still connected with the Department of State, or do you know?

MR. MATTHEWS. I think not. I saw a recent reference to him in the press, which indicated that he was working on some boundary commission in Europe at the present time.

THE CHAIRMAN. Did you know he was a member of the Communist Party?

MR. MATTHEWS. I knew it inasmuch as he freely discussed the matter with me on many occasions during my year of residence here.

I had known him before he became a member of the staff of the State Department, when he was engaged in radical activities as a student in Boston in the early post-war years.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you tell Browder when he made that proposition?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I did not tell Browder that I knew anyone in the State Department who was a Communist. I also told him that I could not get mixed up in any kind of intrigue of that sort.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Field, you say, was a member of the Communist Party. Did you in the course of your activity come in contact with Mr. Saposs, who is now on the National Labor Relations Board, and holds a responsible position in that organization?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, Congressman; I have known Mr. Saposs for a number of years.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his first name?

Mr. MATTHEWS. David.

The CHAIRMAN. What position does he occupy down there?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think he is designated as the chief economist of the National Labor Relations Board.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you knew him. Did any correspondence pass between you and Mr. Saposs?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. I have two letters here from Mr. Saposs on the letterhead of Brookwood, which was a labor college with which Mr. Saposs was connected a number of years.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that labor college?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is no longer in existence, but it was a left-wing labor college for many years under the direction of Mr. A. J. Muste.

The CHAIRMAN. Read us the correspondence you had between Mr. Saposs and yourself.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This correspondence is not particularly pertinent as far as the subject matter goes. It only establishes my personal acquaintance with Mr. Saposs in his salutation as "Dear J. B." and his own signature. It refers to meetings at which I spoke for Mr. Saposs.

One of my other connections with Mr. Saposs was that I personally arranged passage for him and his family when they went to France to spend a year during the time he wrote a study of the French labor movement. I was a speaker on many occasions at Brookwood Labor College during my radical years, and I would have no way of knowing just how many times I did have personal contact with Mr. Saposs.

The CHAIRMAN. Was Mr. Saposs a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to my best information, he was not. I do, however, have information that Mrs. Saposs was a member of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Saposs was a member of the Communist Party; under what name—do you know?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Give us the information you have with reference to that and with reference to Mr. Saposs.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Saposs was the author of a book which has been used widely in left-wing circles and which is now a textbook in the Workers' School of the Communist Party in New York. The name

of the book is Left Wing Unionism, and it was published by the International Publishers, which is the Communist Party publishing organization. I have many quotations marked in the book.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you read us some of the quotations to show us what his ideas were about the revolutionary movement?

Mr. MATTHEWS. One of the principal ideas which it seems to me has pertinence in our present labor relations, and held by all radical organizations with which I was ever connected, is that a new trade-union, in order to develop class-struggle muscle, must engage in a strike. If there are no issues, issues must be manufactured. It is assumed that the trade-union cannot thrive and prosper with a sufficient number of dues-paying members until there has been a struggle in the form of a strike. That struggle may have nothing to do with collective-bargaining relations or wages or hours or working conditions.

I note that on page 147 of this book, where Mr. Saposs himself personally subscribes to that view.

The CHAIRMAN. Read what he says:

Mr. MATTHEWS (reading):

It is also true that unorganized and particularly immigrant and unskilled workers must develop enthusiasm, solidarity, and understanding through mass action and the strike before they can be interested in becoming permanent dues-paying members.

It is sometimes alleged, Mr. Chairman, that Communists do not control certain trade-unions because they are obviously not in a majority in the membership. That argument is for public consumption only, because the universal assumption in all radical circles is that a cohesive radical group of any faction does not need to be any more than a relatively small minority of a trade-union in order effectively to control it. Mr. Saposs subscribes to that view.

The CHAIRMAN. Read us his exact words bearing on that.

Mr. MATTHEWS (reading):

Propaganda bodies chiefly dedicated to the dissemination of sentiments and ideas may exercise far reaching emotional and intellectual influence with a small membership and little material opulence.

The context of that is a trade-union discussion, tactics of radicals in trade unions. That last quotation was on page 171.

This quotation is on page 185 [reading]:

Communists have been carrying on extensive propaganda among the unorganized, especially immigrants, Negroes, and unskilled workers. At crucial periods they will have their staunch followers strategically placed and when a spontaneous strike or other difficulty arises they are bound to be influential.

I repeat that this is at present the textbook or a textbook in the Communist Workers' School.

The CHAIRMAN. You have given us exact quotations from that book?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Give us some more quotations, in order that we may know what his attitude is toward the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, there are a great many, Mr. Congressman. I have not copied out any more than these. It goes very thoroughly into the whole question of the radical trade-union organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Your statement is that Mr. Saposs, so far as you know, is not a party member? Is that right?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is right. Throughout this discussion, there is what might be called unqualified criticism of the so-called business-

trade unionism of the American Federation of Labor, or of the reformist-trade unionism, as it is usually called in Communist circles.

The CHAIRMAN. He was not a party member. Now, were you a party member; you were not, were you?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. How did they designate you?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, as a rule, I should say I was designated as a united frontier. That was a special designation. In radical circles, for a number of years, there were so few of us participating in Communist united fronts that Roger Baldwin and I were called the united front twins. So far as I can determine, my own classification in the parlance of the Communist Party, I was a fellow traveler with too large a degree of independence.

The CHAIRMAN. Was Mr. Saposs regarded as a fellow traveler also?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would not be able to say.

The CHAIRMAN. Going back to this American Congress Against War, and the League Against War and Fascism and the League for Peace and Democracy, can you give us more evidence with reference to the communistic affiliation of this league?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I discovered that I still had in my possession what is called the Organization Handbook of the American League Against War and Fascism which I possessed as a member of the national bureau of the organization.

On page 1 of section 2 of this handbook, the American League itself published this geneology of the American League. In this, the parent of the movement is designated as the Amsterdam World Congress Against War, which was called by the Communist International and convened at Amsterdam, Holland, August 27, 28, 29, 1932.

To the best of my knowledge, there has never been any denial in any quarter that the Amsterdam World Congress was a Communist International organization. Its chairman was Henri Barbusse, who was the outstanding French Communist of that period. I had personal contacts with that organization through the fact that a delegate from the Fellowship of Reconciliation, of which I was executive secretary at the time, went to the Amsterdam Congress and gave me a complete report on the congress. That report itself, officially published by the congress, indicated that there were among the 2,000-and-odd delegates 840 avowed Communist Party members. The rest of them were Communist Party members or fellow travelers under the disguise of the Friends of the Soviet Union, the Anti-Imperialist League, and other Communist united-front organizations.

That body, according to the American League, was the parent body of the American League for Peace and Democracy, traced down through the World Committee Against War; the American Committee for the Struggle Against War; the First United States Congress Against War; the American League Against War and Fascism; and, of course, it is not brought up to date because this appeared before the American League for Peace and Democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The reason we want to get as much proof of that as possible is that it has been admitted by one of the Government

officials who, I think, is the secretary of the local League for Peace and Democracy, that they have some 400 members who are employed by the Government. We want to get this evidence in detail so that it cannot be contradicted, with reference to the communistic origin of the League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Another piece of evidence that bears on that is from the column of Mike Gold, in the Daily Worker of January 17, 1934, on page 5, where Mr. Gold says:

American League Against War and Fascism, a united-front organization affiliated with the International League, headed by Henri Barbusse, Thomas Mann, Roman Rolland, Maxim Gorky, and other great spirits.

I have here also, Mr. Congressman, some letters from the executive secretary of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. That organization recently withdrew from the American League for Peace and Democracy; the fact is they withdrew since your first testimony—is that not a fact?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct. Their withdrawal was announced in the New York Times October 17, 1938, on page 17. Miss Dorothy Detzer was one of our original united-front workers in the American League and I have indicated already she and I were made members of the Committee for the Struggle Against War, at the same time, and both designated as "important."

On January 29, or perhaps it was a few days prior to that—I will find the date in a moment—toward the end of January 1934 there was a mass meeting of the American League Against War and Fascism in St. Nicholas Arena in New York City. Miss Detzer and I were both speakers on that occasion. Here is a flyer announcing the meeting. The date was January 29, 1934. Earl Browder was also a speaker.

Harold Hickerson, a well known Communist, was another speaker, and Dr. Addison Cutler, of Columbia University, was the chairman.

Miss Detzer made a speech on this occasion and Harold Hickerson, a Communist Party member, followed her, and bitterly denounced Miss Detzer for her speech. Here we were all working together in the united front, but that was not an uncommon thing for the Communist members of the united front to attack the non-Communist members.

Naturally Miss Detzer did not feel too good over what had transpired, and as she left the meeting to catch a train for Washington, she penciled a note to me which I have here, over her signature, in which she says, among other things—

J. B.: I am through with this group. We don't really belong in it. The only two times I have spoken before the league the Communists have followed, and have had the final say.

When she reached Washington, I wrote her a letter trying to calm her ruffled feelings. I sympathized completely with her attitude, but I believed it more important that we maintain the united front intact. So I explained in my letter to her that, after all, we must recognize that we were dealing with Communists. She replied to my letter on stationery of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, dated January 31, 1934, in which she said:

DEAR J. B.: I hardly remember a time when I have been so enraged and furious as I was when I left that meeting the other night. I think the answer

is that I personally have no place in the united-front organization. There are limits to how much people are willing to be kicked in the face either publicly or privately, and I am about at the end of my patience in regard to it. I am caught, as you know, between two difficulties—one the attitude of my own organization on the united front.

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, which has just now withdrawn, and in its withdrawal stated that its severance of connection with the American League had nothing to do with the testimony before the Dies committee.

The CHAIRMAN. In addition to your former testimony, it is a fact, is it not, that in 1924 a pamphlet issued by the United Mine Workers, John L. Lewis, the American League for Peace and Democracy was designated as a Communist-front organization?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the hearings which are printed reveal that in this official document from Mr. Lewis of the United Mine Workers they designated the Civil Liberties Union and the League for Peace and Democracy as front organizations of the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No, sir; in that particular document the American League for Peace and Democracy did not appear. It was organized afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean the League Against War and Fascism. Was it designated in that report?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No, sir; because that was not yet organized.

The CHAIRMAN. It designated the American Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir. Before we leave this point, perhaps you will want me to give two other pieces of evidence.

The CHAIRMAN. First, let us clear this up. Let us take that report.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The report of the United Mine Workers on Communism, according to my recollection, appeared about 1924.

The CHAIRMAN. Then it could not have referred to the League for Peace and Democracy and the League Against War and Fascism, because they were not in existence.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is true.

I have here a copy of the first issue of *Fight* magazine, of which Joseph Pass was editor. A box on the second page designates me as chairman, William Pickens as vice president, and Donald Henderson as secretary. Even a casual examination of that first issue of the magazine will disclose the Communist character of the publication. For example, the first article is by Henri Barbusse, the well-known Communist. The second article, entitled "Cuba," is by Martin Kaye, also a well-known Communist; a third article is by Langston Hughes, the Negro poet, and well-known Communist. The fourth article is by John Strachey, who denies that he is a Communist. The next article is by Nan Lee, who is a Communist, and I find that I contributed an article entitled "Germany and the War Peril." Then there is a cartoon by the well-known cartoonist for *New Masses* and the *Daily Worker*, Gropper. Next is an article by Roger Baldwin, and then an article by Harold Hickerson. There is another by Joe Shields, who writes for the *Daily Worker*.

I want to call attention to an article by Paul Sifton. Paul Sifton is at present the assistant administrator of the new Wages and Hours Administration. He is assistant to Mr. Andrews, and I think the record should have what Mr. Sifton wrote in this first issue.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; put it in. In view of the important position he holds in the new wages and hours organization, I think it is well to know how he feels.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Among other things, he said this:

Tell them you know that they know they're sunk unless they can start a war to make their \$200,000,000,000 in debts look better than a trainload of waste paper; tell them they and their fancy pieces of paper and the whole capitalist shell game can sink and be damned.

Tell them that we've got another war on, closer home, a war to establish a workers' peace, a workers' government.

(They know this anyway, but they hate to be told.)

If you want to make it snappy, tell them that workers have been played for saps long enough. Tell them to go to hell! Then make it stick.

The CHAIRMAN. That was in the first issue of this publication Fight, which was the official organ for the League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I note this from the report of the United Mine Workers:

There are 200 organizations in the United States actively engaged in or sympathetic with the Communist revolutionary movement as directed and conducted by the Communist Party of America. Some of them are local in their scope and work; others are Nation-wide. Forty-five of these organizations of either "pink" or radical structure are engaged in the Communist effort to seize control of the labor unions in this country and convert them to the revolutionary movement. In virtually every instance these organizations have direct contact, through the mechanism of interlocking directorates, with the central executive committee of the Communist Party of America, or with its "legal" branch, the Workers Party of America.

I note that it says further—

Illustrative of this arrangement is the executive committee and the national committee of the American Civil Liberties Union, at New York, posing as the champion of free speech and civil liberties, but serving as a forerunner and trail blazer for the active and insidious activities of the Communist, among labor organizations. Harry F. Ward, born in London in 1873, and chancellor of the Union Theological Seminary, is chairman of this organization. The managing director is Roger Baldwin who served a term as a draft evader in the Essex County jail in New Jersey in 1918 and 1919.

So that here is a full report of the United Mine Workers, and of Mr. Lewis, in which they designated all of those front organizations, and it designated the American Civil Liberties Union as a forerunner and trail blazer for the Communist movement in America. With this report coming from that high source, it is rather paradoxical that they would seek now to make light of what this report disclosed at the time it was made.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You may be interested in some quotations from Roger Baldwin. I have been closely associated with Roger Baldwin in this organizational work, and we were active in other than the Communist united-front organizations. Roger Baldwin wrote in a book entitled "Socialism of Our Times," and at page 77 of that book he said:

I would rather see violent revolution than none at all.

On page 77 he also says:

Trade unionism alone furnishes a class base of revolutionary power for the exploited masses.

On page 80 he says:

You cannot touch militant labor activity anywhere without finding Communist inspiration and participation.

If I may go further, I would like to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is very interesting in view of the fact that some prominent officials of this Government belong to the American Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. From these quotations it is clear that Mr. Baldwin is advocating communism. I will read one more quotation:

Its (the Communist Party) main policies center on what are obviously the two greatest issues looking to labor and Socialist control—the building up of revolutionary consciousness in the trade unions, and support by western labor of the movements for colonial independence.

That appears on page 80 of the book.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Matthews, I have some other work to do, and I think it would be well for you to come back here at 1:30 p. m. and continue your testimony. You have there, I believe, some original letters from Communist-front organizations and well-known Communists showing how they feel about the left-wing branch of the Democratic Party, and what their plans or proposals are. I want to develop that this afternoon. These are letters sent out by political writers in Washington dealing with the question of a third term for the President, and dealing with whom they want to put forward as the nominee in the next convention. We want all of those documents. Unless you have the originals, we may have photostatic copies. We want that so there will be no dispute about the authenticity of the proof.

(Thereupon, the committee took a recess until 1:30 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

(The subcommittee reconvened at 1:30 p. m., Hon. Martin Dies, chairman, presiding.)

TESTIMONY OF J. B. MATTHEWS—Resumed

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Matthews, before we proceed further with your testimony, may I ask you to tell the committee what your experience was in teaching?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I set out in life with the idea of becoming a teacher, and most of the positions which I have held, which were paid positions, have been in the teaching field. I first taught in 1915, and since that time, I discover from reference to my files that I have been listed on the faculties of 42 colleges, universities, summer schools, institutes, and training schools. Most of them were short term summer institutions. Those teaching experiences were in 17 States and 5 foreign countries.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you told us this morning that you received only approximately \$380 when you were speaking for the front organizations: Did you have any other source of revenue at that time?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir: I had during that period, or approximately during that period and coterminous with it, a pay position as executive secretary of the Fellowship Reconciliation, a radical

peace organization. Also, at other times during that period I supplemented my income by writing, speaking, and teaching at intervals. I drew upon the Capitalist World to pay my expenses while I worked for the Communist World.

The CHAIRMAN. So you had from your work in these other organizations pay positions, and made a living from them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir. I also wrote a number of books which produced royalties.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Matthews, there has been an effort to deny that the American Youth Congress is one of the united front Communist organizations: Do you have anything to add to your testimony on that subject?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir; I have a pamphlet entitled "Youth and Fascism," by O. Kuusinen, which is a speech made at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, held at Moscow in 1935. It must always be remembered that the so-called New Line of the Communist Party which now prevails dates from the seventh world congress in 1935, and the speeches delivered there are, according to the Communist Party itself, the formulation of their present line of activities. For example, at the tenth annual convention of the Communist Party in May of this year, greetings were sent to Dimitroff, and in these greetings it was explicitly stated that the Communist Party of the United States had learned from him how to "win victory." This refers to Dimitroff's speech at the seventh world congress. I refer to the Daily Worker of May 26, 1938, first page. This is a speech which I never had in my hands until the World Youth Congress met. It explains at considerable length what the young Communists in the United States have accomplished through the youth congress. This speaker sums it up in these words:

We need a revolutionary youth movement at least 10 times as broad as our party's, and united fronts hundred of times broader still. That this is entirely possible in many countries is shown by the achievements of the French and American young comrades.

Then the speaker went on to explain what the Communist International intends to do with this youth movement, or revolutionary youth movement which is to be 10 times as broad as the party, the success of which has been illustrated in the American Youth Congress as well as in the French Youth Movement. He goes on to say—

We want to attack our class enemies in the rear when they start the war against the Soviet Union. But how can we do it if a majority of the toiling youth follow, not us, but, for instance, the Catholic priests or the liberal chameleons.

He further explains that this revolutionary youth movement, exemplified by the American Youth Congress, would serve for the defense of the "Soviet country, the fatherland of workers of all countries."

I think it is worthwhile to make special point of the fact that this new line, or present contemporary line, of the Communist Party is not something that was formulated 10 or 20 years ago, and was abandoned shortly thereafter. In two speeches before the seventh world congress speakers made note of the fact that some persons have misinterpreted the new line as a fundamental change in Communist policies. Now, here is Dimitroff's book which contains his speeches, and in this volume, on page 91, Dimitroff says:

There are wisecracks who will sense in all this a digression from our basic position, some sort of turn to the right of the straight line of Bolshevism. Well, in my country, Bulgaria, they say that a hungry chicken always dreams of millet. Let these political chickens think so.

D. Z. Manuilsky addressed the same seventh world congress, and his speech is published in a pamphlet entitled "Work of the Seventh World Congress." I cannot lay my hands on it now, but I will give two important statements from it. Manuilsky said that only down-right scoundrels and hopeless idiots would think that the Communist International has changed its former policies in any fundamental respect. If I may, I will furnish later the exact quotation.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he make this statement, that tactics generally may be changed, but that the general line of the Communist International, which is, of course, steering a proletarian revolution, remains unchanged.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you clarify what is meant by this new line of action that you referred to as the so-called "Trojan Horse" movement?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir. It is frequently called that because Dimitroff in this book emphasizes the need of Communists going into other organizations and working on the inside. One of the resolutions adopted by the seventh world congress which you will find reprinted in the Communist for October 1935, page 923, says that "It is the duty of young Communist League members to join all mass organizations of toiling youth formed by bourgeoisie, democratic, reform, and Fascist parties, as well as religious organizations, and to wage a systematic struggle in those organizations to gain influence over the broad mass of youth."

Some of us who have been close to the movement in the last few years, since these instructions were issued by the Communist International, found that thousands of young Communist League members in the United States have become candidates for baptism and confirmation in churches and have joined other religious organizations to carry out those instructions from Moscow, in order to gain influence over the so-called broad mass of youth. You saw some of them in action at the World Youth Congress at Vassar.

Another illustration of this boring-from-within tactic is to be found in the way the Communist Party is now devising for itself a new genealogy. In the past 12 months, in a series of articles running in the Daily Worker, Communist writers have appropriated various American heroes as a part of the Communist tradition. Among these are George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Walt Whitman, Paul Revere, John Greenleaf Whittier, Daniel Boone, and John Brown.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you have to substantiate that statement? Where are you getting that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Each one of those is from the Daily Worker—from an article in the Daily Worker. And that whole process represents a change of the party with reference to our American heroes.

A few years ago Scott Nearing expressed the line of the party as it was then held in these words:

These revolutions really ushered in the plutocracy as the owners and rulers of the world.

And Scott Nearing was a member of the Communist Party at the time he wrote this book.

The CHAIRMAN. What revolution was he speaking of?

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was speaking of the French and American revolutions. That statement is found in his book, *Where Is Civilization Going?* on page 69.

The CHAIRMAN. Did their attitude change with reference to Thomas Jefferson?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir. At the tenth annual convention of the Communist Party this year, Earl Browder said:

Our program for socialism is organically linked up with, is a necessary outgrowth from, the traditional American democracy as founded by Thomas Jefferson, whose political descendants we are.

That is from the *Democratic Front*, pages 88-89; and that can be illustrated by an experience that I had as an organizer for the American League Against War and Fascism.

I made a trip to Youngstown, Ohio, in 1934, to organize a branch of the American League, and a local college professor had been drawn into the united front as a speaker on the occasion. He suggested to the meeting that the American League should appropriate the traditions of Thomas Jefferson and others in its work; whereupon the local Communist Party organizer arose and denounced the professor in emphatic terms, stating that his suggestion was counter-revolutionary. I arose, and with an attempted diplomacy which I blush for now, explained to the professor that we should tolerate genealogical differences of opinion in the united front, and I explained to the Communist Party organizer that the professor really meant no harm by suggesting that we take on Thomas Jefferson.

Dimitroff started all this at the seventh world congress. His exact words were:

Comrades, proletarian internationalism must, so to speak, acclimatize itself in each country in order to sink deep roots in its native land.

That is from the *United Front*, page 80.

If all of this sounds a bit incredible, anyone can go to the original source in Dimitroff's book, *The United Front*.

On page 78 he points out how the Italian Fascists have misappropriated Garibaldi, how the French Fascist have stolen Joan of Arc, and how the American Fascists have stolen Washington and Lincoln.

Then he says, in effect, that the Communist Party should go out and do some historical hi-jacking and take over these ancestors from the Fascists who have stolen them. And that is what is being done now in the columns of the *Daily Worker*.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you give us quotations from Scott Nearing's book, *Where is Civilization Going?* Do you have that there?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir.

These revolutions really ushered in the plutocracy as the owners and rulers of the world.

That is the way Nearing described the American and French revolutions.

The CHAIRMAN. What I mean is, is there not a paragraph in that book that reads to this effect:

Furthermore, and unlike the Second International——

Mr. MATTHEWS. Oh, excuse me.

The CHAIRMAN. Read that paragraph.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; I beg your pardon.

Furthermore, and unlike the Second International, the Communist International has mandatory power over its sections. In this sense it is the first real international. All of its predecessors have been loose federations of independent autonomous units. The Communist International is a well-knit unified body under central direction.

Page 68. Where Is Civilization Going?

And that bears directly upon the point that is sometimes disputed now—that the Communist Party is independent of Moscow.

The constitution of the Communist International has not changed since the writing of these words.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Matthews, you told our committee in your former testimony that you would give us a list of names of those whom you had known personally who were active in Communist labor unions. Will you do that for us at this time?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have prepared such a list and will submit it with some explanations of the particular relations which I had with each of the individuals named. Inasmuch, however, as there is little permanence in jobs in this field of Communist labor activity, I cannot say in some cases just where the individual is working today.

Louis Budenz: Louis Budenz is now the editor of the Midwest Daily Record, a Communist Party newspaper published in Chicago. I knew and worked with Budenz for a number of years when he was a leader in the so-called Muste group. I have been on picket lines with him frequently. I contributed articles to Labor Age and Labor Action, two journals of which he was one of the editors.

A few years ago Budenz sent a remarkable telegram concerning one of his colleagues, Elmer Cope, to their organization chief, A. J. Muste. Through its extensive system of espionage—called stool-pigeoning when capitalists do it—the Communist Party got hold of this telegram and published it. Not long ago I asked A. J. Muste if the telegram was authentic, and he assured me that it was, and that it had been stolen from his office by whatever Communist spy was working there at the time.

This is the way the telegram reads—and I am reading now from the Communist, November 1934, page 1184—a telegram to A. J. Muste from Louis Budenz:

Protest Cope getting big allowance for doing nothing. It is time he woke up. Ted and Sam did. Now is time for us to establish leadership in steel. Time to put a stop to all this pampering. When is he going to get arrested so that we can raise some money on his efforts?

In my experience with all these radical groups there is nothing extraordinary about that. It is a common practice for men on the picket lines and in demonstrations—as well as women—to do their utmost to provoke arrest, with a view, among other things, to capitalizing on the so-called issue of civil liberties.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did they publish that telegram?

Mr. MATTHEW. Budenz at that time belonged to another Communist faction, the Muste faction. Subsequently he left that and joined the Communist Party, and is now the editor of their Chicago paper. Presumably they have forgiven him for having done this,

however, since it is a common practice, even among regular Communist Party members, to do the same thing. The only point of that was that they had the goods on Budenz and took advantage of the fact that they had this telegram.

I have known, more times than I could possibly relate to you without consuming an inexcusable amount of time, where these various organizations were running low on funds, and demonstrations were deliberately staged with a view to provoking the police into making arrests so that a committee could be set up to raise money for bail for the defense of political prisoners from the more opulent members of the middle class and wealthy dowagers who were apparently always ready to contribute for such purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, let us get on with this list of names.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The next name is Elmer Cope, who is referred to in this telegram. He is now a Communist Party member also. For many years he has been organizing in the steel industry. For 2 years, some time ago, I personally raised his salary for him while he organized in the steel industry. It was a small amount, but, nevertheless, I did undertake the responsibility for supporting him for 2 years.

Donald Henderson, now head of the C. I. O. agricultural union. As my testimony has made clear, I was closely associated with him in a number of these united fronts.

Louis Weinstock, head of the painters' union in New York. I was associated with Weinstock in at least two united fronts, the National Tom Mooney Council of Action and the American League, of which he was a national committeeman.

Ben Gold, head of the Fur Workers' International Union, and long a well-known Communist, having been the Communist Party's candidate for president of the board of aldermen in New York in 1933. I knew Gold in the united fronts of the American League, of which he was a national committeeman, and also when I was a member of the investigating committee looking into factional disputes among the fur workers.

I think it is perhaps worth while to spend just a minute on these investigating committees. They are a common tactic of the Communists. In this instance the Communists set up a committee to investigate labor disputes in the fur industry. I was asked to become a member of it and did so. The committee was packed either with Communist Party members or fellow travelers or innocent stooges. It was obviously packed, and for that reason the Socialists declined to offer evidence at the hearing. Norman Thomas was invited to appear and declined on the ground that it was a packed committee—packed by Communists. When the report was published I had declined to sign it on the ground that there had been no real hearing held. Nevertheless, the committee gave out to the press that I had signed the report, and my name appeared along with the others in the metropolitan press. I published a retraction of my signature, which appeared in at least one paper.

The point, I think, to bear in mind is that you have these committees of investigation in almost every city in the United States several times a year, and they represent a very clearly defined technique of whitewashing the activities of the Communist Party, and it is always relatively easy, it appears, to get some prominent stooge to allow his

name to be used as the chairman of the committee and bring in findings which command publicity in the press.

The CHAIRMAN. Now let us go on down with the list.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Roy Hudson, long active among the marine workers and former head of the Marine Workers' Industrial Union; now closely associated with Joseph Curran in the Marine Workers' Union of New York. He was on our national organizing committee for the First United States Congress Against War, and later a national committeeman of the American League.

Jack Stachel, the leading Communist Party member in trade-union matters; represented the Trade Union Unity League on our national organizing committee.

Maurice Sugar is a prominent Communist attorney in Detroit, who has recently appeared on behalf of the expelled members of the automobile union—the expelled officers, who have since been reinstated. In 1935, when Sugar was running for judge of the recorder's court in Detroit, I addressed a mass meeting, and the paper representing the mass meeting quoted me as follows—

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have that paper?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Read from the paper itself exactly what it says.

Mr. MATTHEWS (reading):

A ringing call to the people of Detroit to elect Maurice Sugar judge of recorder's court was made by J. B. Matthews, of New York, one of the most prominent national figures in the Socialist Party, at a mass meeting in Deutsches Haus on Sunday, March 10. The meeting was called to protest the campaign of the Hearst press against Soviet Russia and the American labor movement.

"The best way to answer Hearst," Matthews said, "is to elect Maurice Sugar. His election would not only be a tremendous victory for the workers of Detroit but would be like a breath of spring across the entire country. It would be a great step forward toward uniting labor in an independent political movement."

The CHAIRMAN. That is from a publication printed at that time?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is the campaign paper of Mr. Sugar.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; let us go on down the list.

Mr. MATTHEW. Lem Harris, a Communist, prominent in the organization of agricultural workers. He represented the Farmers' National Committee for Action on our national organizing committee for the First United States Congress Against War.

William Dunne, now Communist Party State secretary for Montana. He was very active in our First United States Congress Against War. I named him here because he has also been recently a C. I. O. organizer.

Joseph Gollomb, a C. I. O. organizer in Pittsburgh, and recently the contributor of a eulogistic article on Sidney Hillman in the Atlantic Monthly. I worked with Gollomb for several months on enlisting support for the recognition of Russia. He has long been a Communist Party member.

Perhaps I should say, Mr. Chairman, that I worked for 6 months collecting a list of 810. I think—to be exact, maybe 812—signatures of college and university presidents and bishops and outstanding clergymen, which I presented to the President-elect in December of 1932, urging the recognition of Soviet Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that while you were chairman?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; that was while I was executive secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

The CHAIRMAN. That was after you ceased to be chairman of the League Against War and Fascism?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; that was before I became chairman. That was in December 1932.

That received a good deal of publicity at the time.

Henry Shepard, a Trade Union Unity League leader, and national committeeman of the American Legion. I went to Cuba with Shepard as a member of the delegation of the Anti-Imperialist League.

Then I have a few additional names of Communists who belonged to the so-called Lovestone faction of Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you a letter from Jay Lovestone to you?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Show us that letter. We want all this supported by your documents. First, let us have that original letter from Lovestone to you.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Here it is. As a matter of fact, I have a number of communications here from Lovestone. Here is a telegram.

The CHAIRMAN. Read it into the record.

Mr. MATTHEWS (reading) :

J. B. MATTHEWS,

Flint, Mich.

Sending detailed report Friday's affair. Please consider same before acting.
(Signed) JAY.

Incidentally, this was sent within 2 or 3 hours of a similar telegram from Browder asking me to meet him in Detroit and discuss the same matter, and which I have already introduced into the record.

I have here a long, typewritten letter, which is too cumbersome for the record, I am sure.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that have his original signature?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is signed "Jay."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any one that is signed with his full name?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Here is one—a letter of introduction, dated July 2, 1931.

The CHAIRMAN. Read it in full.

Mr. MATTHEWS (reading) :

DEAR COMRADE THALHEIMER—

Thalheimer was one of the two men responsible for the staging of the Communist revolutions in post-war Germany, when several autonomous Communist republics were set up for brief periods.

The letter reads:

Comrade J. B. Matthews, whom I am herewith introducing, is a conscious Communist sympathizer and a friend of our group. He is very much interested in the situation in Germany, particularly in the conditions in the Communist and labor movement.

I'd appreciate it very much if you would arrange to spend a little time with Comrade Matthews and exchange opinions, information, and impressions with him. I have just seen Comrade Matthews before his leaving, so he's pretty much up to the minute on affairs here.

As ever,

JAY LOVESTONE.

With the signature in full.

Here is a letter of introduction to Maurice Naile, assistant mayor, Mairie de Clichy, Paris, France, which is in the same tone, also

signed by Jay Lovestone; and another one about some legal matter that escapes me. I have no idea what it refers to.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it addressed to you?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; it is addressed to me.

The CHAIRMAN. And signed by Jay Lovestone?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. It says:

I have not yet heard from the lawyer. I expect to hear from him tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. Now that you have established by letters your relationship to him, give us the names.

Mr. MATTHEWS. One of the alleged reasons for Lovestone's expulsion from the Communist Party, of which he was the general secretary prior to Browder's taking that position, was a disagreement on trade-union questions. While I was a member of the Socialist Party, chiefly under the initiative of Lovestone there was organized within the Socialist Party a group of comrades who called themselves the revolutionary policy committee. At the time it was organized I was not aware of the fact that it was done at the initiative of Lovestone. When I was invited to become chairman of the group, I did. It was a sort of habit to become chairman.

The title page of the Revolutionary Socialist Review contains the following:

The executive committee of the revolutionary policy committee is:

J. B. Matthews, chairman.

Francis A. Henson, acting secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. By the way, who is Francis A. Henson?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Francis Henson is now—unless he has been dismissed in the last 2 or 3 days—the administrative assistant to Homer Martin, of the United Automobile Workers, in Detroit.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any article that he wrote about that time?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir. Francis A. Henson was the editor of this magazine, which was published by the revolutionary policy committee, of which I was the chairman. He has in this issue an article which indicates his conception—or did at that time, at least—of what should be done with trade-unions.

The CHAIRMAN. Read some of the article.

Mr. MATTHEWS (reading):

The revolutionary policy committee does not shy at the term "Communist" * * *. It is primarily interested in building a united revolutionary Socialist Party with an effective program in the organized labor movement.

That is from page 26.

Again, on page 29:

The opposite side of the coin is the realization that once the workers firmly establish a dictatorship of the proletariat in any highly industrialized Western State, it will be even more impregnable than the present Soviet Union, which grows more able every day to defend itself against all enemies.

Then Henson quotes approvingly what he was told in Vienna by one of his revolutionary acquaintances. [Reading:]

We did not recognize the necessity of smashing the capitalist state machinery and setting up the dictatorship of the proletariat. It has been a costly lesson, but we have learned it well.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you have read enough from Henson's statements. Now give us the names of these Lovestone Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, Henson is one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. He is one of them? All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir. I learned later, after I had accepted the chairmanship of this revolutionary policy committee, that it had been organized under the initiative of Lovestone, and when I became convinced later in the same year that its real purpose was to bring about a split in the Socialist Party, I resigned the chairmanship of the group.

Other persons associated with the Lovestone Communist group who have been active in the labor movement recently are:

Sam Bakely, who, I am told, has been a C. I. O. organizer in Cleveland.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you know that he is a C. I. O. organizer?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I know that only from the insertion in the Congressional Record by Congressman Cox. I know his Communist connections; I do not know his C. I. O. connections except as I have read them.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know that he is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of the Lovestone faction. As a matter of fact, of course, that is the only way I know that Henson is in the United Automobile Workers' Union, because I read it in the papers so often, and I take it that that is a reliable report in that instance.

I had personal contacts with all three of the Reuther brothers, who have been prominent in the automobile workers' union—Walter, Victor, and Roy. The night that Walter and Victor Reuther sailed for Russia, many years ago, I had dinner with them and saw them off, and had some contact with them while they were in Russia and subsequent to their return. I do not know what their exact political connection are at the present time. I only know that their ideology, if I may be permitted to use the word here, is Communist.

Roy Reuther at least was at one time associated with Lovestone, and, as I have indicated, I know Lovestone personally, and have for a number of years.

Another was Sam Sandburg, who worked with the shoe workers in Boston.

I could extend that list, but it would, I am afraid, gradually taper out into indefiniteness that I do not want to introduce in the record. Being acquainted with a man is sometimes a relative thing, all the way from having met him once to having been associated with him for years. I was associated with Henson for a period of at least 10 years in scores of organizational activities.

The CHAIRMAN. You read from the record this morning a statement by—you do not know anything about Homer Martin, do you?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I do not know him, personally.

The CHAIRMAN. You read in the record this morning a statement by Mr. Sifton, now an assistant under Mr. Andrews, the head of the Wages and Hours Board. Read us some more of some of the things that Mr. Sifton said. What is his first name?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Paul. Here is an article entitled, "Uncle Sam Wants You."

The CHAIRMAN. You also have some things written by another Paul, have you not? You might read that in a few minutes. But go ahead with what you started to read.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It says:

Hey, there, Big Boy, Uncle Sam wants you for the next war. He wants you to take \$30 a month (less payments for bonds and thrift stamps, and so on) for doing this:

Saying yes, sir, to bright boys in officers' pink pants.

Packing 60 pounds of clothes, shoes, hardware, and food on your back through mud, ice, dust, and heat.

Digging trenches in the ground like a half-witted woodchuck while your family back home scratches around for food and fuel.

Shooting holes in men like yourself across a line.

Getting wounded yourself, in the leg, or arm or chest or guts.

Getting gassed so that your skin curls up like bacon on a fire and you cough up your lungs.

Dying all at once or by inches or maybe living to stand in bread lines after it's over.

How's that? "Like hell!" you say? Then speak up—say it now! Say it loud! Back it up with action before "the leading citizens" can get the war started, before they begin slapping you around with bayonets.

You do the leading; set the fat boys back on their bottoms and keep them there; keep them blocking; keep them ducking; don't let them tie you up with their bull about patriotism.

Ask them how close to the front they got in the last war—in any war; ask them how much money they made while you, or your brother or father, were fighting to make the world safe for Mellon and Insull and Krueger and Krupp."

Don't be a mug. Make up your mind what you want and then go after it. The fat boys won't thank you, but you can look yourself, your wife, and your children in the face. And the chances are that you'll live a damn sight longer and better.

I quoted the rest of the article this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Read that; I want to get that into the record.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It says:

Tell them that we've got another war on, closer home, a war to establish a workers' peace, a workers' government.

(They know this anyway, but they hate to be told.)

If you want to make it snappy, just tell them that workers have been played for saps long enough. Tell them to go to hell! Then make it stick!

The CHAIRMAN. Now read from the other Paul's statement you have there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am afraid I do not recall the other Paul you are referring to.

The CHAIRMAN. Paul Anderson. Haze you not a statement by him?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; excuse me.

This is from the St. Louis Post Dispatch, dated December 27, 1936, page 3B, by Paul Y. Anderson, a staff correspondent of the St. Louis Post Dispatch:

The Senate will see a real radical when Ernest Lundeen, the Minnesota Farmer-Laborite, takes his seat in that body January 5. It probably would not be quite accurate to say that he is a Communist. So many people have been called Communists in recent years who obviously were nothing of the kind that one dislikes to use the term except in connection with avowed members of the party. However, there is no doubt that Lundeen is farther "left" than anybody who ever occupied a seat in the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever have a conversation, or any conversation, with Mr. Ben Golden?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is Ben Golden?

Mr. MATTHEWS. At the time I had contacts with Mr. Golden he was an assistant regional director of the National Labor Relations Board in New York under Mrs. Elinor Herrick. I was connected with a con-

cern, the Consumers Research, which had labor difficulties, which we alleged were instigated by known members of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that? Give us the date of that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The labor trouble started in September 1935.

In November 1935 Mrs. Herrick asked me to submit whatever documentary evidence I had to Mr. Golden. I compiled the material and submitted it to Mr. Golden, who went over it and asked me to come to New York to see him. I did. We lunched in a Schrafft's restaurant on lower Broadway near the headquarters of the regional offices, and Golden told me he had gone over the material, and he was convinced, himself, that we had not a labor dispute on our hands but a case of conflict with Communists.

He then gave it as his opinion that it would be to my interest to accept arbitration of the dispute, and his proposition was about the following:

Having announced our willingness to accept arbitration we would meet with the representatives of the so-called union, and we would work and work and work, and agree upon arbitration, and we would decline to accept any arbitrator they named, and obviously they would decline any we named, and finally, Mr. Golden, who would be present, would speak up and say that as a Government representative he would take on the position of arbitrator, that I would agree, in advance, to accept that, and the union would have no choice in the matter because it would damage their case to refuse to accept.

Mr. Golden told me, with no doubt in his own mind that if we agreed to such a form of arbitration there was no doubt whatever about the business in that case, that he had on previous occasions found against Communists in similar circumstances, and asked me to look up a copy of the New Masses where it was reported he had served as arbitrator in a case involving seamen in which he had found against the Communists and had been roundly denounced by the New Masses. I have not the slightest idea whether there is such an article in the New Masses, because I have not looked it up. Mr. Golden assured me if I did not agree to this form of arbitration, the case would pass out of his hands into the hands of Mrs. Herrick and, said Golden, Mrs. Herrick is playing 100 percent with the Communists, and, he said, you will have no chance whatever before her.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you do after that conversation?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Golden and I were alone, and I wanted, if possible, to have some kind of verification of that conversation. I asked him to let me think the matter over, which was a bona fide suggestion on my part, because I realized that possibly we might save a great deal of expense in settling the matter in that fashion. I asked him to wait until I got to Washington, N. J., where I could consult with two of my colleagues. And we decided we would not accept.

The CHAIRMAN. What colleagues?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Directors of Consumers Research.

I then called Mr. Golden back. We have a telephone system whereby at least three of us can have separate telephones and hear the same conversation, and all three of us heard the conversation, and the other two made notes of it for purposes of verification.

I then briefly discussed with Mr. Golden about arbitration and I assumed that he would find against the Communists and Mrs. Herrick would invariably find for the Communists, and then I informed

him that we had decided that we had such a perfectly airtight case that we will go before the National Labor Relations Board in hearings and settle it in the regular way.

The CHAIRMAN. You have those two colleagues prepared to verify that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; affidavits have been made on that point once, with the idea of introducing them into the circuit court of appeals.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have those affidavits?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No, sir; I do not have them with me, but I will provide them for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the Consumers Research?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Consumers Research was a testing organization, designed to test consumers' goods and report on their relative merits for the confidential information of consumers who wished to subscribe to the service.

The CHAIRMAN. Who ran the organization?

Mr. MATTHEWS. For a number of years I was one of the members of the board of directors. The president of the organization has been Mr. F. J. Schlink.

I think I had better complete what happened to those affidavits.

We had hearings before Trial Examiner Charles A. Wood, and as Mr. Golden assured me, the Board found against us and ordered us to comply with certain specified terms, including the reemployment of the individuals who had gone on strike and the payment of the back salaries in full, all of which would have amounted to several thousand dollars.

The decision of the Board came almost 2 years after the strike; in fact, in the summer of 1937 the decision was handed down.

We declined to comply with the order of the Board, and the Board entered a plea in the Third District Circuit Court of Appeals at Philadelphia.

The record was printed in full, in galley form, at some considerable expense to the United States Government, or the taxpayers.

The hearings had covered a period of at least 10 days, and then we received a suggestion that if we would settle for the sum of \$100 cash the whole thing would be called off, and we would not have to comply. We provided the cash delivered in a bag, in cash, not checks. We did, and the case was withdrawn from the circuit court of appeals.

The organization was faced with spending close to \$25,000 to keep from paying this \$100, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. Who made that suggestion?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That suggestion came through a series of individuals whose tracks are covered up, and I am bound, I suppose—I have been told I am bound to do no more than to reveal the fact that the case had been withdrawn and the settlement made on those terms.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was the \$100 paid to?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The \$100 was paid to two of the men, who got \$50 each. There were 40 supposed to be reinstated and 3 to get payment of back salaries. Two of them got \$50 each.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us the names of the men who got \$50 each?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I do not know that, because the transaction was conducted in the dark. I know about the sum because I was

assistant treasurer of the organization and it was my duty to know, at least vaguely, with reference to the expenditure of the organization's money.

The CHAIRMAN. When did that occur, with reference to your withdrawal from these united-front organizations; was that before or after?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That occurred almost within the past year.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you cease your connection with the united-front organizations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Three years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you happen to know Ben Golden?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, I did not know Ben Golden personally. I do not say this in any attempt to be inmodest, but Golden assured me that he knew me very well, had seen me in action, and he was deeply interested in preserving my liberal reputation; that if I fought the strikers I would acquire an illiberal or reactionary reputation, and he did not want to see that happen.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the date of this article written by Sifton that you read?

Mr. MATTHEWS. November 1933. That is in the magazine, Fight, page 11.

The CHAIRMAN. You are going to supply us for the record all this documentary proof, the various editions of the Daily Worker, as I understand it. How many times did they mention you?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I cannot supply those because that would be an impossible load of photostating, which I could not afford. I do not possess those. I went to the New York Public Library and went through the files.

The CHAIRMAN. Covering what dates?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I went through every edition, or issue, of the Daily Worker for a period of 5 years. I had all of the issues for 5 years.

The CHAIRMAN. And you made a calculation of the total number of times?

Mr. MATTHEWS. In 1 year there were 183 references. It would be too costly for me to have those photostated.

The CHAIRMAN. What is Mrs. Herrick's name?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Elinore.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you still with this Consumers Research?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you sever relations with them?

Mr. MATTHEWS. At the end of June 1938. As a matter of fact, I would have severed relations—

The CHAIRMAN. You said this case was withdrawn after that; that is your testimony, as I understood it. Who withdrew the case?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The National Labor Relations Board only could withdraw that. The National Labor Relations Board obviously had to be satisfied that enough of compliance had been achieved to justify them to withdraw it. That is the objective evidence.

The CHAIRMAN. You say two of the employees—what are the facts; who got the \$100?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The facts are that a certain lawyer, a certain Communist lawyer, got the money.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he representing the employees?

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was representing the employees, Mr. Abraham J. Isserman, of Newark.

The CHAIRMAN. The \$100 was turned over to him?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. In satisfaction of any claims the employees had, as your employees, employees of the Research Council?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. How many employees did you say they have?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Altogether there were 112 on the pay roll, and about 42 went on strike.

The CHAIRMAN. So that these 42 employees got nothing out of it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The money was delivered by the Research Council to the lawyer?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The money was delivered by our counsel to their counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. Thereafter the case was withdrawn?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Thereafter the case was withdrawn from the circuit court. I have the galley proofs from the circuit court. I would have brought them along, but they fill a suitcase.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you said something to the effect that each of the men was supposed to get \$50.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; under this, \$100 each—

The CHAIRMAN. No; I was not talking about that. The back salary amounted to about \$2,000?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; it amounted to several thousand dollars; I never computed it.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you made the statement with reference to the \$100, and I understood that two men were to get \$50 each.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. What two men were those?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not know. That is the part that is more or less covered up in the dark.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that represented to your counsel by the other counsel, Mr. Isserman?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is the way it came to me. I am told, I should say, that there are legal conditions that do not leave me entirely free.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the two employees get the \$50 each?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not know whether they did or not.

The CHAIRMAN. All you know is that the money was delivered to your counsel to be delivered to the other counsel.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was delivered to our counsel and the case was withdrawn from the circuit court; that is as much as I know, that \$100 was delivered, and the National Labor Relations Board withdrew the case from the circuit court after our refusal to comply.

The CHAIRMAN. All the rest is hearsay, so far as you are concerned?

Mr. MATTHEWS. All the rest is hearsay, as far as I am concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you testifying with reference to what your counsel told you during the process of settlement?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think it amounts to that.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the style of that case? Do you have the style of the case pending before the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. MATTHEWS. You will find it in the published records of the Board. I cannot name the exact title, but it was known, or it was the Technical, Editorial and Office Assistants Union, Local 20022, I believe, against Consumers Research.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that proceeding first instituted?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Hearings were held before Trial Examiner Charles A. Wood in Newark, in December 1935, and the Board reached a decision a year and a half later.

The CHAIRMAN. That would make it the latter part of 1936.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That would be 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Board found that you had to restore these men to employment and pay back wages; is that right?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. After the final decision by the Board, then who first approached your counsel or officials, you and the others, with reference to this \$100?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Did anyone approach you?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, I was vice president of the organization and assistant treasurer, and I calculated carefully that it would cost at least \$15,000 to carry the case through the circuit court.

The CHAIRMAN. You ought to know who first approached you on the proposition.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It probably was our counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It may have been my colleague, Mr. Schlink; it was within the circle of the board of directors and counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. He knows about this decision, besides Mr. Schlink and the others?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did these directors know about this transaction?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; and of course our counsel knows about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Your counsel know about it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you make any record of the \$100?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; that was not a part of the agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. What reason did the Board assign when they withdrew it, do you know that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know the reason assigned?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You do know the proceedings were dropped?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct, and it seemed to us to be infinitely cheaper to pay it, even though it had been several times that amount than to carry it through the circuit court and obtain a moral vindication, if possible.

The CHAIRMAN. As to Ben Golden, who approached you on this matter, did you say whether or not he was a Communist?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I do not think he was, no. I am assuming there is an article in the New Masses in which the Communists denounce him for having ruled against them in the seamen's case. He

assured me there was such, and I can look it up, but I never went to the trouble of looking it up. Of course, we did not seriously consider accepting the arbitration proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. With reference to your testimony this morning, do all of the letters and magazines and other documents you read from carry the dates?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. They speak for themselves?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And that will be incorporated in the record?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You cited this morning 28 Communist united front organizations with which you were connected in one way or another?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In support of your statement that you were connected with these organizations, you referred to issues of the Daily Worker and other pamphlets. How much of that do you have just for record purposes? How many of those documents do you have, yourself?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have everything except the back issues of the Daily Worker.

The CHAIRMAN. And they can be obtained?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I was in the New York Public Library when I read them, from which I made my extracts. They could be photostated, but I could not afford it.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee is interested in having all of this documented.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In every case I have given both the number as well as the date of the issue of the Daily Worker.

The CHAIRMAN. But you referred to other magazines and other clippings.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have those here. I have the Communist, and the Handbook, and the Socialist Review, and the Student Outlook, and various others.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you if you know what is the Communist activity now with reference to political elections and parties. Do you have any information with reference to their present political activities?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, Congressman, I have such as one can obtain from the current issues of the Daily Worker. I read the Daily Worker now every thoroughly. I did not read it in former years; in fact, I had scruples against reading the Daily Worker when I was associated with the movement. It shattered my confidence in the possibilities of the united front to read the paper.

The CHAIRMAN. When you were operating with the united-front organizations, were you sincere in your radical beliefs?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; as far as it is possible for a man to be sincere.

The CHAIRMAN. Was your change of opinion or heart gradual or sudden?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Very gradual, and perhaps it will be pertinent to say that my severance of my connection with the united-front organizations, while it dated from the time of the strike at the Consumers

Research, that had nothing to do with my own convictions regarding the so-called revolutionary movement, and that is a matter of record.

Weeks after the strike I was still in contact, by correspondence and personal meetings, with such men as Harry Ward, my successor in the American League, and I have a letter from Ward in which he thanks me, not as one who has deserted the movement, but as one trying to advance its cause.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you read us that letter? That was after the strike occurred?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is right; that was after the strike. I have the letter here.

Here is a photostat of it. I have the original here also, Mr. Chairman, in my file.

The CHAIRMAN. Read the letter from Dr. Ward to you and the date.

Mr. MATTHEWS. October 13, 1935. The strike occurred on September 4, 1935, some 5 to 6 weeks earlier.

DEAR J. B.: I greatly appreciate the spirit shown in your resignation from the bureau of the American League. Your readiness to subordinate your personal fortunes to the advancement of the common cause at this point commands my respect. I wonder if you would care to have me show your letter to Browder and Hathaway.

Faithfully,

HARRY F. WARD.

The CHAIRMAN. You have the original letter?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; I have the original letter here.

The CHAIRMAN. That letter was written after the strike?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Five to six weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. Did your severance of relationship with these united front organizations have anything to do with any subsequent job that you got or any advancement materially?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; not at all. As a matter of fact, it was all the other way around, if anything.

Congressman, for the past 3 years, up until June 30th, I was on a salary at Consumers' Research and my income was supplemented in such other ways as writing for magazines and making occasional lectures. I have had no other source of income whatever and I think perhaps it is not irrelevant for me to say that the opportunities for lecturing are greatly diminished when one ceases to be a radical in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. While you were connected with the united fronts and the radical organizations, did you have many opportunities to lecture?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Congressman, my record proves—whether you would believe it or not—that I made as many as 325 speeches a year for year after year after year.

The CHAIRMAN. What proof do you have of that fact?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have a half a trunk full of newspaper clippings and letters and correspondence and diaries, and such like.

The CHAIRMAN. So that your change of heart, your change of conviction, occurred after you had secured your position with Consumers' Research, is that true?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No. I was connected with Consumers' Research for many years as a member of its board while I was engaged in

these united front activities. That was just one of my official connections. I know it will sound ridiculous for me to say so, but I was engaged in many radical organizations besides those under the control of the Communists in their activities. At one and the same time while I was officially connected with 15 Communist united fronts, I was officially connected with 35 other radical organizations, making a grand total of 50 official positions.

The CHAIRMAN. What proof do you have to support those statements?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The organizations' own literature; the fact of my vice-presidency of Consumers' Research is on the letterhead and literature of the organization.

I was executive secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. You will find that in their literature.

I was on the board of directors of the League for Industrial Democracy, a Socialist organization. I was chairman of the Revolutionary Policy Union and was also a national committeeman on the Joint Committee for Unemployment.

The CHAIRMAN. The official literature of those organizations will show your connection with them?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you will supply this committee with all those documents?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, that is a pretty big order. I have not promised to do that unless I have more time than I can see right now, because it is a matter of going through disorderly files, not kept by a secretary. I could supply them to you, but not within a few days. I could not do that physically. Eventually I could do it.

The CHAIRMAN. In addition to the documents, the newspapers and pamphlets and files, etc., that you have submitted, you are prepared, if any of your statements are challenged, to submit proof of your affiliation with each one of these organizations?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. Anyone who will take the time for research can find them in the press indexes of the New York Times and various other magazines. I was chairman of the First World Youth Peace Congress in Holland, just to give you some more examples.

The CHAIRMAN. What proof do you have of that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. There were hundreds of magazine articles written on that, as well as a few books, which described my chairmanship. That was 10 years ago.

I was treasurer of the Joint Council on Peace, an international organization. I have the letterheads of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair would like to have you prepare—although I know it entails a great burden on you—a list of these other documents, so that if your official connection with these various organizations is challenged by anyone, the document itself can be introduced in this record as proof.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have some stray ones here. I was a speaker at the Third National Convention of the Communist Party Opposition. Among the speakers are J. B. Mathews, Charles S. Zimmerman, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. What are you reading from?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This is a little card announcing the annual banquet of the Communist Party opposition. That is the non-Stalinist group.

The CHAIRMAN. Give us all the documents you have, because we want the record to show proof with reference to your official connection with these organizations; we want your statements to be supported by documentary proof.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have one brief file here, a partial file, on a Socialist Party connection—no, I find that I left that at my hotel. My brief case was not large enough to bring them all at one time. But I shall be very glad to do that as time will permit. I do not know but it might be a simpler task than I envision at the present time. I have made a list of those, however, from memory.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like you to be prepared to furnish this committee with the date and pages of the newspapers—not all the newspapers, but enough so that we have documentary proof in case your testimony is challenged. You will be prepared to verify that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I shall be very happy to do that. I can give you whatever I have in my files, consisting of letters, clippings, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. Was this Consumers' Research Counsel a radical organization?

Mr. MATTHEWS. In its essential make-up; no. In actual practice, members of the board of directors were individually radical until some of them went one way and some went another.

The CHAIRMAN. What union was involved in this dispute with the Consumers' Research Counsel in this strike? With whom were they affiliated?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The group was first affiliated with the Office Workers Union, which was a union in those days affiliated with the Trade Union Unity League which, in turn, was affiliated with the Red International of Labor Unions. It was a Communist office workers' union, in other words, and recognized as such in your own testimony by Mr. Frey. I believe he went into that in some detail.

Now the groups have been merged, the Office Workers' Union and the Bookkeepers', Stenographers', and Assistants' Union, a former A. F. of L. union, and the merged union is now a C. I. O. affiliate.

The group involved in our dispute shifted from the Office Workers' Union to what they called a Federal charter of the American Federation of Labor before the strike occurred. And incidentally they shifted on my advice, which they sought. I did not offer it. They asked me if I thought they should remain in the Communist union or join an A. F. of L. union, and in accordance with my own political beliefs, I thought it was best to bore from within the A. F. of L. So they took my advice and began to bore from within the A. F. of L. They then introduced that testimony against me at the National Labor Relations Board hearings and the Board found me guilty of having violated the Wagner Act by talking to them on the subject, even though they sought my advice.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the records of the National Labor Relations Board will bear out all of this?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct. By the way, Mr. Chairman, the leader of the strike was a lady who came to Consumers' Research from the editorial staff of the Daily Worker, if there is any doubt about the political connection.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was she?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Susan Jenkins. She has since organized several of these Communist united fronts for consumers, including the Consumers' National Federation.

The CHAIRMAN. What is this Research Counsel—what is the official title?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Consumers' Research.

The CHAIRMAN. Incorporated?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the laws of what State—New Jersey?

Mr. MATTHEWS. New Jersey at present. It was originally incorporated under the laws of New York, but the organization moved from New York to New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it still in existence?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You were going to tell me about the political activities of the Communists at the present time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I stated that I had such knowledge as one can glean from the Daily Worker. I follow that pretty carefully because I am interested, as all of us are, in political developments.

In the Daily Worker of October 3, 1938, on page 5, there is an article signed by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, who is a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the United States, entitled "With Gurley Flynn on Pennsylvania's Democratic Front."

Progressive forces rapidly lining up to defeat G. O. P. reaction at the polls.

Starting a month in eastern Pennsylvania to go forward with the New Deal and defeat reaction at all costs and functioning as an active organizer of the Communist Party at the same time, made my week end in Philadelphia exciting and interesting.

That is from Elizabeth Gurley Flynn's article.

The CHAIRMAN. Their activity does not only consist of boring within the Democratic Party, but it is true of the Republican Party likewise, is it not?

Mr. MATTHEWS. In rarer instances. The Communist Party, for instance, is very, very actively supporting Vito Marcantonio in his congressional race in New York. Marcantonio is a candidate on both the Republican Party ticket and the American Labor Party ticket.

The CHAIRMAN. So that they have no party line; wherever the best opportunity is, that is where they go?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of course, that is Communist strategy. I think I reminded the committee of a quotation of Lenin's when I appeared here before, that the Communist Party is prepared to make a coalition with any group whose interests in any way coincide with it at the moment. And whatever group it thinks can best further its purposes at a given moment it is willing to back in what might be called that opportunistic fashion.

A complete perusal of the copies of the Daily Worker during the current campaign will leave no doubt whatever about the fact that the Communist Party is throwing its full force, whatever that is, behind the candidates in Pennsylvania and Ohio and New York who are running on the so-called New Deal program, with the exception of Vito Marcantonio, who is a Republican candidate.

The CHAIRMAN. That is based upon statements in the Daily Worker?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. That is amply borne out by statements in the Daily Worker. The tour of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn is simply one of many such items which the committee could avail itself of if it had secretarial assistance, to show the way in which the Communist Party concentrates its forces in particular areas, which suggests what is commonly known in radical circles as the Communist strategy for the conquest of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. From your experience and contacts with Communists, do you know of any geographical strategy that they have?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; I do. If I may finish this other point—

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I see here in another issue of the Daily Worker:

James H. Fay, candidate for the Democratic nomination for Congress in the Sixteenth Congressional District in New York is addressing a mass meeting, or was addressing a mass meeting made up of three Communist united front organizations.

That is according to the Daily Worker of September 16, 1938. Then again:

Senator Bulkley of Ohio was the chief speaker at the annual convention of the Workers' Alliance in Cleveland this year.

There is other such evidence which will indicate that the party is concentrating its efforts in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. Not that it is neglecting other places entirely, but that is the picture. And that fits in with the question you just asked me about their strategy. It is discussed on occasion—I mean the matter of how and where the party is going to build its forces for the forcible seizure of the American Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you get to that, do you know that this woman, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, is a Communist?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Daily Worker that you have there says that she is a national committeewoman.

The CHAIRMAN. Could she be on the national committee and not be a Communist?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No. One must be a party member to be on the national committee. That is what John Strachey just stated in reply to the State Department, that he could not be on the national committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain, as has been charged, because he is not a member of the party.

The CHAIRMAN. I interrupted you on your reference to this geographical strategy. Will you continue?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The outline of the plan is to build the strongest revolutionary movement in what is known as the industrial triangle. The industrial triangle is an area the three points of which are Detroit, New York, and Pittsburgh. I have heard it said by comrades that within that area the real industrial power of the United States is concentrated. I do not know whether that is true or not. I have not looked it up. But that is the claim I have heard put forward, that if the Communists can build a strong enough movement in that triangle, and at these three points, the victory is nine-tenths won.

Of course, of secondary importance geographically is the Pacific coast. That would give a western boundary, so to speak, to the eastern stronghold, in this industrial triangle.

Of third and vital importance is the south, where the reliance is freely based upon the incitation of the Negro population against the white population.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you have to support that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I find that from many conversations that I have had and the party literature for years was filled with the slogan, "The Self-Determination of the Black Belt." That was the official party slogan.

How the self-determination of the black belt was to be achieved is also set forth in a pamphlet entitled "The Negroes in a Soviet America," by James W. Ford and James S. Allen, a pamphlet dated 1935, not one of the older ones. Mr. Ford calls, in that pamphlet, reverence for the ballot, "This old fairy tale." That is on page 13. He then elaborates that on page 14 by saying:

We emphasize that capitalism cannot be done away with by the ballot.

And again:

Anyone who tells you to depend upon the ballot and civil rights for your defense is betraying you.

These are sample extracts which might be drawn almost indefinitely from Communist Party literature on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. How do they plan to accomplish that in the South?

Mr. MATTHEWS. You mean this incitation of the Negroes?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. By the usual appeals of the Marxian program, which is that the capitalist exploiters are grinding the poor, and the poor exploited workers must rise up and destroy the oppressive capitalists and landlords. That is the theme which runs through all of this literature.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the ballot?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The ballot is set down as a fairy tale.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they plan to abolish the poll-tax requirement? Is that part of their program?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. They are working at that for the present time. And this I think should be said: They do not mean that Negroes should not go to the polls wherever they have the opportunity to go to the polls. They mean that the Negro should not rely for the establishment of a soviet America on the ballot. For the time being, yes, in the intermediate stage, yes, by all means, use the ballot wherever they can avail themselves of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Matthews, for the time being we will conclude your testimony. The Chair wants to request, however, that you make this additional search of your files and of these newspapers so that before this record is closed we will have in the record documentary proof to substantiate the statements you have made, in addition to the documents that you have already provided, of course.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You mean with reference to my organizational connections?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH LEIB

(The witness was duly sworn.)

The CHAIRMAN. Your name is Joseph Leib?

Mr. LEIB. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a political writer?

Mr. LEIB. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. An independent writer?

Mr. LEIB. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have occasion during this year to write a series of letters dealing with the political situation?

Mr. LEIB. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you write to Mr. Clarence A. Hathaway?

Mr. LEIB. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the Daily Worker?

Mr. LEIB. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he the owner of the publication?

Mr. LEIB. The editor.

The CHAIRMAN. The editor of the Daily Worker?

Mr. LEIB. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you also have occasion to write to the New Masses, that is published in New York City?

Mr. LEIB. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have occasion to write more than one letter to Mr. Hathaway, the editor of the Daily Worker?

Mr. LEIB. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have occasion to write to the New South, a Journal of Progressive Opinions, Birmingham, Ala.?

Mr. LEIB. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have occasion to write the Daily People's World?

Mr. LEIB. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a newspaper?

Mr. LEIB. It is the official paper of the Communist Party in the West.

The CHAIRMAN. In the West?

Mr. LEIB. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have occasion to write Mr. Arthur Sigismund, of the American Labor Party?

Mr. LEIB. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. What position does he hold?

Mr. LEIB. He is publicity director.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have occasion to write Mr. Steve Nelson, of the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. LEIB. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What position does he hold?

Mr. LEIB. He is supposed to be one of the associate leaders.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you receive answers from each of these parties?

Mr. LEIB. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I want you to look at these letters in order to identify them and state whether or not they are the letters that you received?

Mr. LEIB. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was your purpose in writing to these particular parties?

Mr. LEIB. To find out the sentiment on a third term for Roosevelt.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you write to others besides these particular parties?

Mr. LEIB. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I want you to say whether you received these letters and whether you received them in the due course of mail.

Mr. LEIB. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. These are the letters you received [exhibiting letters to witness].

Mr. LEIB. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

The first is a letter from the Daily Worker, dated September 9, 1938, as follows:

DAILY WORKER,
50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.,
September 9, 1938.

Mr. JOSEPH LEIB,

Washington Political Writer, 1397 National Press Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIB: It must be understood that neither my note of the 27th nor this one are to be quoted, nor am I to be brought into your story no matter how you may choose to handle the information.

Now, as to your questions:

It is my impression that the average worker, and this impression is based on many conversations, is not concerned with the formal question of the third term. They are not, generally, discussing the matter. It arises not as a problem in the mind of the average worker but rather in the minds of political speculators, columnists, etc. (No offense.)

I do not think the average worker has serious objections to a third term. If, in 1940, they thought that to carry out Roosevelt's policies it would be necessary for Roosevelt to accept the nomination for a third term they would support Roosevelt. I do not believe that the workers would rise up against him.

As I expressed before, they are concerned with social legislation, with the unfolding of the New Deal, and not with musty traditions.

Sincerely yours,

C. A. HATHAWAY, *Editor.*

The next is a letter from the New Masses, and right at this point, Mr. Matthews, I will ask you to resume the stand.

TESTIMONY OF J. B. MATTHEWS—Resumed

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Matthews, what is the New Masses?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The New Masses is a weekly publication. It is a Communist publication. The name of the publishing corporation slips my mind at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a Communist Party publication?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir; it is well known as such.

The CHAIRMAN. This letter from the New Masses, dated August 26, 1938, reads as follows:

AUGUST 26, 1938.

JOSEPH LEIB,

1397 National Press Bldg., Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIB: My information does not indicate that the people are doing much thinking about the question of a third term for President Roosevelt. I believe they are much more concerned with what is happening now and what the outcome of the elections will be. Those that I come in contact with would

favor a man like Jackson or Ickes in 1940 rather than any of the others who have been mentioned. However, my contacts do not in any sense represent a cross-section of the population.

I hope this covers the questions that you asked.

Sincerely,

A. B. MAGIL, *Editor*.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Matthews, do you know Mr. Magil?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I know who he is.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he a well-known Communist?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir; he has written a number of pamphlets.

The CHAIRMAN. The next is a letter from the *Daily Worker*, dated August 27, 1938, as follows:

AUGUST 27, 1938.

Mr. JOSEPH LEIB,

1397 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIB: Through my contact, chiefly with the worker's movement, in many sections of the country, it is my impression that the workers of the country are little concerned with abstract discussions about a third or fourth term, or what not. They are concerned with the social legislation embodied in the so-called "Vote New Deal."

They are for the N. L. R. B., the wages and hours bill, etc., and they will answer the question of who carries the banner of this social legislation only in 1940.

Sincerely yours,

DAILY WORKER,
C. A. HATHAWAY, *Editor*.

The next is a letter from the *New South of Birmingham, Ala.*, dated September 1, 1938. Do you know what the *New South* is, whether it is a magazine or newspaper?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is a magazine.

The CHAIRMAN. It is published how often?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I believe it is a monthly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it, or not, well known as a Communist publication?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is a relatively new publication, and, therefore, would hardly be a well-known publication, but it is well known as a Communist publication. Among the persons listed on the editorial board are James Ford, Rob Hall, and other such well-known Communist Party officials.

The CHAIRMAN. This letter from the *New South*, is dated September 1, 1938, and reads as follows:

Mr. JOSEPH LEIB,

1397 National Press Bldg., Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIB: Your letter of August 25, addressed to Chattanooga, Tenn., has been forwarded to us.

There is not as yet very much discussion in the South on the subject of the Democratic nominee in 1940. The majority of the southern people support the President and his program and to them it is not very important whether the candidate should be Mr. Roosevelt himself or someone else who can be trusted to carry on the New Deal. But on the other hand there is a reactionary element interested in nominating a candidate who would abandon Mr. Roosevelt's progressive program and return to the old days of free exploitation and disregard of human want and suffering. These reactionary forces are strongest in Mississippi, South Carolina, and to some extent in Virginia; and weakest in Florida, Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee, and North Carolina.

The names mentioned (Ickes, Jackson, Wallace, Farley, and Hull) are all regarded as New Deal men and are all undesirable and unacceptable to the "right" wing forces, with a slight possibility they might accept Mr. Farley. Other New Deal people who should be on the list of possibilities are Governor

Murphy of Michigan and Hopkins. We do not mention the candidates of the reactionaries—a minority yet a noisy one. Their logical candidate is Senator Clark (with Wheeler and Garner as other possibilities, and maybe even George or Tydings if one or both should be successful in winning renomination). Many things may happen between now and 1940—including changes in the international situation. Now, it is only clear that the lines between the progressive and reactionary forces in the party are becoming sharper.

While the majority of the southern voters are behind Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal, this majority would be very much greater if large sections of the populations were not disfranchised by poll taxes and other regulations. In spite of these restrictions we have had the examples of Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, and North Carolina, where candidates supporting the New Deal have defeated opponents openly opposed to the Roosevelt program or correctly regarded by the voters as being "yes, but" men. Reactionaries as yet can point only to South Carolina.

Very truly yours,

PAUL CROUCH, *Editor.*

The next is a letter from the Daily People's World. Do you know what the Daily People's World is?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir; that is a Communist newspaper published on the Pacific coast.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question about its being a Communist publication?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. This letter from the Daily People's World is dated August 31, 1938, and reads as follows:

Mr. JOSEPH LEIB,

1397 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Concerning your inquiry of August 25 regarding the matter of how voters of the west coast feel about a third term for President Roosevelt.

It is our observation that the voters on the west coast have a marked lack of feeling so far on this question. It is true that a few of the reactionary papers have editorially mentioned this question and some of the columns of eastern political commentators that run in such papers have also brought it up. But if there is any reaction among the mass of voters it fails to be visible to the naked eye. Only here and there will one hear individual comment from New Deal supporters that if "they" won't allow Roosevelt to carry through his policies he should run again.

Respectfully yours,

HARRISON GEORGE, *Editor in Chief.*

Mr. MATTHEWS. Harrison George is Earl Browder's brother-in-law.

The CHAIRMAN. The next is a letter from the American Labor Party, New York State, and there is a notation on it, "Please do not quote my name."

This letter is dated August 31, 1938, and reads as follows:

Mr. JOSEPH LEIB,

Washington Political Writer, 1397 National Press Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIB: Mr. Rose is on vacation and I have been making an effort to find a previous statement by him on a third term for President Roosevelt. I have not been able to locate this statement, but, as I remember it, he took the opportunity to reaffirm his faith in the New Deal, indicate a respect for the tradition against third terms, and say that this problem would have to be settled in the future.

I may add, for your information only, that the Labor Party suspects that this third-term interest is being fostered in part by the enemies of the President, and that we said his organization had no wish to encourage them by adding fuel to this fire. "To us," he said, "politics is a serious business, and while we appreciate the great services that can be and is done by newspapermen, we also realize the uncertainties on the future and regard the third-term discussion at

this time as purely academic. We feel that we can only be definite in the face of actualities."

If there should be time I will try to get a statement from Mr. Rose when he comes back. Otherwise, I hope this answers your question and ask you to accept this as the explanation of a press agent who is never quoted.

Yours,

ARTHUR SIGISMUN, *Publicity Director.*

The next is a letter from the American League for Peace and Democracy, national office, 268 Fourth Avenue, room 701, New York, N. Y. The letter is dated September 2, 1938, and reads as follows:

Mr. JOSEPH LEIB,

*Washington Political Writer,
1397 Press Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. LEIB: My impression in reference to the question of the third term is that the labor people in particular are not worrying so much about the past traditions regarding this question, but rather are more concerned with the problem of who will serve them best from the standpoint of their economic needs.

I believe that the discussion that is occupying the attention of the people and the press regarding this precedent which has been established in American history doesn't really carry as much weight among the common people as the press would lead us to believe.

I hope that this will clear up the question you requested me to answer,

I remain,

Fraternally yours,

STEVE NELSON.

Do you know, whether or not Steve Nelson is also national president of the Friends of the Lincoln Battalion?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not know that.

The CHAIRMAN. So these letters bear out your testimony as to the efforts to bore within political parties whenever the opportunity presents itself. Is that correct?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It is illustrative of their strategy and policy in the political field to undertake to pose with the left wing on one side and the right wing on the other side, and drive a wedge between them; is that true?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hopes to have Mr. Martin here on Wednesday. He agreed to be here Wednesday morning, and we will adjourn until then. At that time, if Mr. Martin honors his subpoena, he will be here.

(Thereupon, the subcommittee adjourned to meet on Wednesday, November 9, 1938, at 10:30 a. m.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1938

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10.30 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

Present also: Mr. Mosier and Mr. Mason.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. We have some witnesses here this morning. Mr. Homer Martin is involved in strike difficulties in Detroit and also the C. I. O. convention, but we notified him that we would not excuse him; we would hold the matter in abeyance awaiting his attendance the first part of this week. I do not think there is any question but that he will come here in the next few days.

The first witness this morning is Mr. Zygmund Dobrzynski.

TESTIMONY OF ZYGMUND DOBRZYNSKI

(The witness was duly sworn.)

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Zygmund Dobrzynski.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you live, Mr. Dobrzynski?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. In Detroit.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been in Detroit?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. All my life; 26 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-six years?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a graduate of high school?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What high school?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Eastern High.

The CHAIRMAN. Eastern High School of Detroit?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes; well, I am a graduate in that I finished out my high school in night school, in various schools of Detroit.

The CHAIRMAN. Various night schools of Detroit?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any other education besides your high-school education?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are now a member of the U. A. W.?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The United Automobile Workers?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. With what particular local are you?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, I am a member of local union 205. That is the fiber local in the U. A. W. But my official capacity is national organizer of the U. A. W. Ford drive.

The CHAIRMAN. You are the national organizer for the U. A. W.?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. National director.

The CHAIRMAN. National director?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the organizing committee?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the U. A. W.?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. For the Ford Motor Co. plant?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. It being your function to supervise the organization of the workers in the Ford plant?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. How large a local is this to which you belong?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Approximately 4,000 members.

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately 4,000 members?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this an important union? Is it an important local?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, yes; it is a key local insofar that it manufactures the interior body trimmings for all the automobiles of all the major companies—Chrysler, General Motors, and Ford.

The CHAIRMAN. It is one of the key locals; is that correct?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, what would happen to the industry if this local went on a strike, let us say?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, the industry would be eventually forced to shut down.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what you mean by a key local?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The ability of this particular local to compel a shut-down of all the plants?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The automobile plants?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Would that be confined to the Detroit area?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. No; it would paralyze practically the national organization of the three major independent companies I mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. What other locals would you designate as key locals in the U. A. W.?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, it is difficult to mention one local; there is a series of locals which could paralyze the automotive industry.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you give us some of them?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Almost any of the locals that manufacture local parts, such as bodies, springs, wheels, and all the other accessories; but very few locals have the amalgamated set-up of the various plants all under one local which would control or which would have the power to paralyze the entire automotive industry.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, in order to understand you correctly, your local 205 is so constituted that it is in a position to paralyze the whole industry?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. But there are very few other locals in the U. A. W. that are so organized or so constituted; is that right?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, other locals do not have that central control?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well——

The CHAIRMAN. What is the expression to describe it correctly?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I would not state it exactly that way. There are some locals, such as the tool and die, the manufacture of dies for the automobile plants, that knock out the parts for them, who could paralyze it, but this local in particular is a very strategic one. It is one of the most strategic ones.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been connected with the U. A. W.?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Approximately 3 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Three years, you say?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Approximately 3 years.

The CHAIRMAN. You are in good standing at the present time?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You are here under a subpoena that was issued to you?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct. I would not be here otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you first become interested in labor work, labor activities?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. About the time I had my first job, I guess.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I worked in a cleaning plant, a large cleaning plant, that cleaned clothes. At that particular time they had a drive, a union drive.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that; about what year?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That was in 1929, just before the depression.

The CHAIRMAN. 1929?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. What part did you play in the organization of the workers in that dry-cleaning plant?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I did not play a very active part at that time. I was new in the union movement. I did not play a very active part. I was interested.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the occasion of your joining the U. A. W.?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. The plant I worked in, the National Automotive Fiber Co.——

The CHAIRMAN. When did you start working for that plant?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. About 1933, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. That is when you first became interested in the work?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I became interested in the work gradually, in the course of my various occupations. I became convinced that organized labor, organized on the basis of unionism strictly, would prove to be of great benefit to the workingman, the men working in these plants, and, realizing that fact, I became interested, I

became active, and was instrumental in assisting in the organization of that plant. In fact, after the organization of that plant, and a short strike that we had at that particular time——

The CHAIRMAN. About what year was that short strike?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. 1936, the fall of 1936.

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. No; I beg your pardon; December 16—I remember the date, December 16. We signed a contract on the day following. We had a very short strike, where we had a small picket line.

The CHAIRMAN. What part did you play in that strike?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, I was the leader of the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. You were the leader of the strike?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right. After a very short strike the company and the local union there came to an understanding and have worked together very amicably ever since. The relationship today is very excellent between the union and the management; never had any trouble since that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Since you became identified with the U. A. W. have you been very active in organizing work?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes; very active. I have devoted practically my full time.

The CHAIRMAN. Since about what period?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Since that period.

The CHAIRMAN. Since 1936?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you work inside the plant now?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I do not work inside the plant now. I am a full-time organizer of the U. A. W. at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. Has your work brought you in contact with the entire labor movement insofar as the U. A. W. is concerned?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes; pretty much so.

The CHAIRMAN. You have had occasion to contact the various officers and directors and organizers throughout that entire area; is that true?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. In the course of your activities as organizer, and even before then, from the very beginning, we will say 1936, have you had occasion to observe the activities of Communists within the labor unions?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes; very much so.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say it has been a considerable experience that you have had?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes; it has been a considerable experience; considerable trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. And that experience is not confined wholly to your local, but to other locals; is that right?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. No. From the information I gather from the men I work with, representing various local unions, that seems to be the trouble; they seem to have difficulty in that respect generally, more so in some sections than others.

The CHAIRMAN. In order to get this picture from the beginning, will you tell us when you first came in contact with the Communists? Begin with when you first observed their activity in the unions.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, the first time I ever came in contact with the Communist Party elements I would say to any appreciable degree

was during the period of 1931 and 1932, when a group of us organized the Unemployed Citizens' League, a league of unemployed citizens. We organized this because of the fact that the only other existing organization of the unemployed councils was then pretty much under the control of the Communist Party, and it was known generally—I mean it was understood generally that was so.

The CHAIRMAN. That was known as the Unemployed Councils, was it not?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Unemployed councils. We set up a cooperative group who believed that by going out to the farmers and market keepers, and so forth, offering our services while we were unemployed, we could possibly receive in return, or we could secure in return for our labor on the farm or in the market, a certain portion of the produce. That was the basis upon which we established this organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you help establish that organization?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes. I was one of the charter members of that organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Before we get to that organization, is it a fact that the Unemployed Councils later merged with the Workers Alliance?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I understand that is the fact; I am not certain.

The CHAIRMAN. How many members did your organization enlist?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. About 6,000. That was the peak membership.

The CHAIRMAN. What experience did you have there with the Communists?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. The Communist Party infiltrated, or sent people—I mean, our organization was open—sent in people who knew how to express themselves much better than the ordinary citizen because of their experience in speaking, and were skilled in the various tactics, political maneuvering, and so forth, and eventually they succeeded in disrupting the entire organization and it finally collapsed. That was their original purpose and they succeeded.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you explain to us how they succeeded in disrupting and destroying that organization?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, they sent people in who firstly, inside of the organization, would eulogize the unemployed councils as the ideal organization.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean they would eulogize—

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. The other one.

The CHAIRMAN. The other organization which was a Communist organization?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct; and would tear down, in the meantime, our organization, by spreading false statements to the effect that the men in the leadership were crooked and were taking most of the produce for themselves, and in that way they created dissention to the extent where it was not possible to operate the organization for the benefit of the members.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they adopt any plan of filibustering? Describe that.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, it has been my experience generally, not only then but since then, that their plan is usually to send in a small group of people who will attract to themselves many innocent people, well meaning, not knowing exactly what they are in for, and to continue filibustering the meeting until the honest-to-goodness members

of the organization become disgusted and walk out, go home, after 3 or 4 or 5 hours of constant heckling, filibustering; leaving the meeting in the hands of this disruptive element. That has been the general practice not only in the Unemployment Citizens' League but in the union as well, wherever they had any force.

The CHAIRMAN. That applies to their strategy in every union wherever they have any organized members?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. In order to get the picture clear, let us assume a meeting; you have called a meeting and say you have 1,000 people present. Did you ever have that many present, 1,000?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Oh, yes; many times.

The CHAIRMAN. When the meeting started, what would be the tactics from then on of the Communists within that meeting?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, usually their people are schooled in parliamentary tactics; I mean by offering objections and points of order and making long-winded speeches, and generally postponing the regular purposes of the meeting; they usually are able to discourage the greatest portion of the membership, especially of those uninitiated members, members new to organization who do not understand the basis of the conflict as yet. They usually go home. After 4 or 5 hours, one can easily understand why various members would become discouraged and would go home.

The CHAIRMAN. About what percentage would go home before final action was taken?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Many times I have seen 90 percent of the meeting go home.

The CHAIRMAN. Ninety percent?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Then after the 90 percent have gone, what do the Communists do?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, then they become very orderly and business-like and the order of business goes through very rapidly, of course, with their motions and their particular policy being put across on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. They are then able to pass resolutions?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And control the proceedings from that point on?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Do the Communists work with any other radical groups within the organization; I do not mean work with them, but do they control any other radical groups within them?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Not to my knowledge. Radical groups—you mean—

The CHAIRMAN. I am talking about the revolutionary Socialists; do you have any of those in there?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I have heard various organizations have been penetrated to some extent by Communist Party members, but I am not in a position to speak as an authority on that particular matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of other groups, such as the Communist Party opposition, the followers of Lovestone?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Do I know some?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I say, do you know of their activity?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of the activity of the revolutionary Socialists?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I do not believe I ever heard of them.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not believe you have heard of them. Have you heard of the so-called Unity Group?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. The Unity Group in the U. A. W. was made up of various elements; I mean some Socialist Party elements, if that is what you mean—the Socialist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. The Socialist Party have some people who call themselves revolutionary and some who call themselves very conservative. I mean, there are diversified elements; and the Communist Party and other hangers-on who do not belong to any political organization but who join that political group for some grievance or because they happen to be misled. There are many people who are perfectly good citizens, perfectly good people, insofar as the union is concerned, who are misled because of their experience.

The CHAIRMAN. Now you have described the experience that you had in this first organization that you say reached a peak of 6,000.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you say after that this organization was disrupted?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Did it go out of existence entirely?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. It went out of existence completely.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say that was the result of the activities of the disruptive elements in it, the Communists?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. Their infiltration and their activity brought about this disruption?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes. In fact, up until that time our organization was in the black; I mean, we were feeding hundreds of people and we did not have a treasury, because we did not earn any money; we merely had produce, and, after all, that was the thing we were primarily interested in, something to eat, at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. After that experience, tell us what happened in the U. A. W., in your particular local.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. In my particular local, of course, at first, when it was organized, we could not detect any differences among the membership. But shortly I did get offers from certain individuals in the U. A. W. to cooperate with the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know William Weinstone?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes; I know him.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you known William Weinstone?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. My acquaintance with him is rather short; 2 or 3 days, I would say.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you first meet him?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, I met Weinstone in the spring of 1937; May 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is William Weinstone?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. He was the State secretary of the Communist Party. Since then he has been transferred, I understand, to New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the occasion of your first meeting with William Weinstone; about what time in 1937 was it?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. May.

The CHAIRMAN. May 1937?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Just preceding our local union elections for officers.

The CHAIRMAN. That was just preceding your local union election of officers?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us the occasion of your meeting him; why did you meet him? Did he send for you?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes; he sent an emissary around, a man by the name of Miller, I could not tell you his full name, who represented himself as the sectional organizer of that particular section, the north Detroit section.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the Communist Party?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Of the Communist Party. This individual, of course, hung around the headquarters of the local union and often offered his assistance in turning out literature and peddling literature, etc. We used him to peddle literature. We never knew who he was at that time. The organization was growing so fast, we took anybody's assistance. We never knew who he was. But later he identified himself to me as a sectional organizer of the north Detroit section of the Communist Party and said—I was president of the local at that particular time—and said that William Weinstone wanted to speak to me. Of course, I did not run right down to William Weinstone; never had much use for the Communist Party. I went to the International. I talked to——

The CHAIRMAN. Let us get this William Weinstone meeting clear. After he told you that William Weinstone wanted to see you, did you go to see Mr. Weinstone?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes; after consulting the leadership of the union.

The CHAIRMAN. You first consulted the leadership of your union?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. With reference to whether or not you ought to go there, is that right?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you decide on—what did you and they decide on?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. They suggested that I go and talk to him, find out what he had to say; because at that time the leadership was inexperienced in methods of counteracting the activities of the Communist Party in the union and they wanted to find out exactly what the policy was. They thought it would be wise if I talked to Weinstone for my own benefit and for my own local union, insofar as information was concerned, and for the benefit of the union as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. Then did you go and talk to him?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you instructed to pretend sympathy for the Communist cause in order to find out what his plans and tactics were?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, I pretended to have sympathy for certain parts of his cause; not completely, because——

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us what took place when you saw Mr. Weinstein, what you said and what he said.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I really had two conferences with him, one following the other, 2 days in a row. One was about 2 hours in duration; the other one was about 6. I mean, there were many things discussed there. Of course, the first meeting, what he was primarily interested in was my local union.

The CHAIRMAN. Why was he interested in your local union?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, he mentioned the fact that it was a key local in the automotive industry, and it was a very strategic one for any organization to control.

The CHAIRMAN. What did he say he could do with the organization?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, he said they could use it as a sort of reserve to paralyze or shut down the automotive industries if the other defenses that they would build up would fail. He was speaking of his organization controlling it, naturally—the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. What did he say he wanted you to do to help him and the Communists get control of your union?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. The local union elections were coming up and he was interested in getting certain of his people as members of the Communist Party or sympathizers—I would not swear they are members; some are sympathizers and some merely work with the Communist Party in the union movement for personal gain. But he wanted me to place certain people on the local executive board, one as a vice president and two—that is, one as a treasurer and one as a financial secretary. The funds seemed to be of interest to him.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he mention any other key position in your union that he was interested in?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes. He also mentioned the fact that the steward, the position of steward in the shop—the steward is the man who takes care of grievances, negotiates the grievances with the head of the department, from the side of the management, rather—and he was interested in getting a number of men placed as stewards in these departments. At that time I—due to the rapid growth of the organization—I appointed stewards until the time came when the organization became consolidated sufficiently where the membership itself could elect them. That is the reason he was interested in influencing me to place certain men as stewards, men who were close to the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, if they had succeeded in placing Communists or Communist sympathizers in the positions of treasurer, secretary, and stewards, what would those positions have meant from the standpoint of the control of the union?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, they would have had control over the address and every name of the membership, or the entire membership of the local union. That is one thing. Secondly, they would have control of the finances, and would naturally be able to influence the spending of the funds. Thirdly, the vice president could be used to counteract me if I ever became antagonistic to their methods in the union. In other words, those are the standard offices they try to influence. Of course, they would try to get the president's office if they could, but I happened to be there at that particular time.

The CHAIRMAN. What position would they have been in if they had secured those key offices in the event of a strike or in the matter of calling a strike?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, having that number of men on the executive board, they would probably have been in a position to direct the policy of the union. I mean that the executive board of every national makes recommendations to the membership and usually the membership accepts them, especially in the case of a new organization in which the membership is not well developed. Of course, they could call a strike, authorized or unauthorized, and do many other things.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, would it be correct to say that they would be virtually in control of the union?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he ever offer you any incentive or promise or anything of that sort to get you to agree to those propositions?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir. He told me I was a smart young fellow, and would go a long ways in this thing if I would follow the proper line, and that he could even visualize the vice presidency of the union and perhaps the presidency some day.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he say that the Communists would deliver their full support or place it behind you in the event you went along with him?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he tell you about their success in other unions?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Oh, yes; he enumerated quite a number of their own members—that is to say, he enumerated quite a number of people—he was trying to impress me with the strength of this organization—he enumerated quite a number of people who were working closely with the Communist Party at that time. It was a very imposing list which he presented to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he tell you of any Communists or Communist sympathizers within your own organization that you did not know about?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir; there was a couple that I thought were my best friends, practically. Later on I found that they were working for the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he give you the names of those parties?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many did he give you the names of?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. At least six or seven.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they hold key positions in the union?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. One of them did.

The CHAIRMAN. What position did he hold?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. He held the position of treasurer.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you remember the name?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Charles Wind.

The CHAIRMAN. He was treasurer of this organization?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. At that time; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Were any of the people that he named stewards?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir; there were a few who were stewards at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give the names of the stewards that he named?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I do not remember all of them. I remember Dan Schaeffer.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he tell you of key positions held in other locals of the U. A. W. by Communists or their sympathizers?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir; he mentioned the fact that Local 155 was controlled by them, or was led by their people.

The CHAIRMAN. What was that local?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. The tool and die local.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he say anything with respect to his position in the union, or with reference to all the unions, and what he could do in the event of a strike or anything of that sort?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. According to his statement, which I think was exaggerated, they practically controlled the union, but I think that they do not. He was trying to give that impression. He mentioned so many on the board or among the leading officers of the international union who were working with them at that particular time.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he say anything to you with reference to their ability to tie up the automobile industry, the glass industry, the rubber industry, or any other industries?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. He did state that they carried on quite a bit of organizational work in the rubber and glass unions, and he did emphasize the fact that the automotive industry was the center where the Communist Party had concentrated most of its forces, its most capable people, and a large amount of its funds. He pointed out the political significance which the automobile industry has to the Soviet Union, so far as pressure against the Government is concerned. He stated the fact that the automobile industry has a tremendous influence on the glass, rubber, steel, and many other industries, but primarily the glass, rubber, and steel, which are heavy industries, and that the Communist Party by controlling the unions, by having people such as me, who are bright and smart, working throughout the trades, they knew they could wield tremendous pressure against the Government insofar as securing concessions for the Soviet Union was concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. What about it in case of war?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. In case of war, naturally, the automobile industry is the biggest tooling industry.

Mr. MOSIER. Did he mention that?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir; he mentioned that it was the biggest tooling center, and he recognized the fact, he told me, that in case of war, by having control of the U. A. W. A., or the automobile industry, they would be able to wield economic pressure on automobile and other production for the Army in this country. It would not be the center—it would be the core. Therefore, he said, if the United States carried on a war in contradiction to the Soviet Union, they would wield tremendous pressure in pulling political strikes, or strikes for political purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. You had two conversations with him, one lasting about 3 hours and the other about 6 hours.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Were there any other material facts touched upon in the conversations that passed between you and Mr. Weinstone?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, he did mention, of course, something about tactics. He mentioned something about the types of tactics and strategy that they used. I mean by that, the type of people they worked

with. At one time I had a discussion with him as to the purge. I criticized his organization for the purge in Russia. I disapproved of that and told him why. He said, "We will get a good many people in the union." He said, "We must work in the union with people like Ed Hall, and some others."

He said, "Those people are not Communists, but are individuals who seek careers." He called them reactionaries. He said that when the time comes that the Communist Party has control, with this type of individuals, they must be purged. Of course, they could not shoot them here, but he said they must purge them. In other words, he pointed out that there was a similarity, and so he justified it from that particular angle.

THE CHAIRMAN. Can you think of any other material conversation you had with him?

MR. DOBRZYNSKI. That is difficult, to state offhand all the details of the discussion. Oh, yes, there is one particular item which I think was important, and that was the fact that they had a system. He showed me the file that they had. He recognized the fact, first, that the Communist Party had a tremendous turn-over of 70 or 80 percent each year. The membership keeps coming in and going out, with an influx of new members. While the membership was stable, there was a new membership, with members coming in and members going out. The turn-over was tremendous. They kept trying to work on these people, the idea being that Communists would contact those people who used to belong to the party, and exert influence on them whenever they could. The impression was that they were carrying the Communist Party program into the unions, and that as a result of that, they would be quite a formidable force.

Some people, seeking to secure a great social revolution, will join the Communist Party, and then, after joining it, they will become convinced that it is not the type of organization they want to belong to, and will drop out. In other words, they had a tremendous turn-over. He showed me the methods they were going to pursue as a means of recruiting union membership. Possibly they could not get them on the political philosophy, but insofar as cooperation in the union was concerned, they would try by one means or another to get their cooperation.

THE CHAIRMAN. You say he told you about the tactics and strategy that they used. Will you tell us something about that?

MR. DOBRZYNSKI. He outlined to me, first that they had meetings of people in the unions who were their members, and they would have meetings outside of the union of the Communist Party trade-union unit. At that time they called them fractions. I do not know what they call them today.

They will discuss among themselves the methods to be used in gaining control and advocating whatever the leadership opposed them with, and then by cooperating with a small group, by preparing motions ahead of time, having discussions ahead of time, and then by dividing up in various sections of the hall, they would give the impression that the particular policy which they were trying to have the meeting adopt was generally supported throughout the membership. Since most of them are fairly capable speakers, due to experience, they were able to make the local unions put across motions that the membership did not agree to but did not know how to combat.

The CHAIRMAN. All of that was arranged in advance of the various meetings in which they would agree to a program that was to be put forth in the union meeting.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They would place their members in various positions in the hall so they would have the appearance of general approval?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he say anything with reference to raiding the treasuries at that particular time?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. He did not put it that crudely or in that way, but he mentioned the fact that the Communist Party had influence over certain organizations against war, this, that, and the other thing, involving the Spanish children, and what not, and that by coordinating the activities of those organizations they could secure certain funds, and that those organizations, being in turn controlled by them, or influenced by them, would vote, perhaps, all of their treasuries to the Daily Worker or to other particular funds they were trying to raise. That was the method he outlined.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of your own knowledge that that method was carried out?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. In my local union?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir. Some members are identified as carrying out Communist Party plans, or people from those organizations would come to us. We were a very democratic organization and would let almost any organization speak to us.

They would make their appeals, and it was very apparent that they were pre-arranged. I mean that by offering motions after the speech would denote that it was all pre-arranged ahead of time, and that it worked with machine-like precision.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mosier had to go to the Supreme Court and the Chair wishes to talk to a witness who is in here. Therefore, we will suspend until 1:30 o'clock. You will be back at 1:30 o'clock, and resume your testimony.

(Thereupon, the committee took a recess until 1:30 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

The subcommittee resumed its session at 1:30 p. m. Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

TESTIMONY OF ZYGMUND DOBRZYNSKI—Resumed

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Dobrzynski, I believe you were testifying before lunch with reference to the conferences or conversations you had with Mr. Weinstone: Did those conversations take place in his office?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir; they took place in the Communist Party headquarters—that is, the Michigan headquarters of the Communist Party. The building is either at Twelfth or Fourteenth and McGraw.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one thing I want to clear up due to what has been said about political affiliations: What party do you belong to?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I do not belong to any party, although I did vote Democratic. I am not officially affiliated with any organization.

The CHAIRMAN. You voted Democratic in the last election.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you give us the names of the individuals mentioned by Weinstone as either being Communist or sympathetic with communism? Can you give us the names of those people?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. In the course of the conversation many names came up. I cannot remember all of them, but I can possibly enumerate a number of them.

The CHAIRMAN. When he referred to those people, I think you stated before lunch that they were key people.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you give their names?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I might as well begin at the top.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have the list I asked you to prepare?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I did write out a list, but I mislaid it. I believe I can give them from memory.

Mortimer was referred to as an officer who was their man. He was definitely their man.

The CHAIRMAN. He was an officer of what?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Vice president of the United Automobile Workers Union.

Mr. MOSIER. Is that Wendell Mortimer?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Formerly of White Motors?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir. He was also on the board, or executive board.

The CHAIRMAN. Of what?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Of the international union, or the U. A. W. A. I can recall at least one—he mentioned Lloyd Jones. He is a new member of the board. He is president of Local No. 2 at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. What is Local No. 2?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Murray Bodies. He did lay stress on the activities of Bob Travis in Flint.

The CHAIRMAN. What position did Bob Travis hold?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. He was organizer at that time. He was discharged shortly afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN. He was organizer for what?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. For the U. A. W. A. He was discharged soon after. Also, John Anderson. He is an officer in No. 155 at the present time. He was organizer at that time for the U. A. W. A.

The CHAIRMAN. What was that?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. The tool and die local that I referred to previously. There was Nat Ganley.

The CHAIRMAN. What position does he hold?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. He is also an officer in Local No. 155.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he an organizer for the U. A. W. A.?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. No, sir; both have been discharged.

The CHAIRMAN. But both of them were organizers.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir. There was also Stanley Novack. He was also discharged as an organizer.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the U. A. W. A.?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Does he have any position in any local at the present time?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other names you can recall?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, Bob Stone is president of Local No. 136. That is the L. A. Young Spring & Wire Corporation. Then there is Paul Gold of that same local.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he hold a position in that local?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I believe he is treasurer. I am not sure, but he is an officer of some kind on the executive board. I would not be positive what his position is. He also mentioned the Reuthen brothers, Victor, Roy, and Walter, as workers with them. He stated, of course, that they were members of the Socialist Party and not of the Communist Party, but that on certain policies they worked in conjunction with each other.

The CHAIRMAN. You say he mentioned Roy, Victor, and Walter Reuthen?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir; as workers with him in the union on certain policies. He stated to me that they were not members of the Communist Party, but were members of the Socialist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what he told you?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it Victor Reuthen who spent 2 years in Russia? Which one spent some time in Russia?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I did hear or read that two of them spent some time in Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. But you do not know which?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is the statement Weinstone made.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he mention anyone else that you now recall?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Not offhand; no.

The CHAIRMAN. If you later recall any other names, you can give them.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir; surely.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, after your conversation with Mr. Weinstone, did you have any other conversation with any organizers in the U. A. W. who spoke to you about becoming a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, not after that.

The CHAIRMAN. Not after that?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. No; because after that, at the local union elections that were coming, we definitely tripped up Mr. Weinstone, and I have been many things except a good citizen since then.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you trip him up, Mr. Dobrzynski?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, we failed to boost his particular candidates. We put up some of ours, and we defeated every man except one; and on a 21-man board, one person does not amount to much.

The CHAIRMAN. When were you approached by them?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. At one time we got information that there was a company spy in the plant—in our plant—and we cornered this fellow and made him admit that he was a spy for the corporation at that particular time. Well, since I participated in that exploit, the Communist Party gave me quite a write-up in the Sunday Worker. They listed me as an active rank and file worker who was militant, and all that sort of stuff. They gave me a big build-up.

They figured that a fellow who had all that fire ought to join the Communist Party.

Well, I was approached by three of the organizers.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you remember the names of any of them?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, Stanley Novak, John Anderson, and Nat Ganley. They all worked out of the same office at that time, and they tried to sell the idea of joining the Communist Party at that time. I didn't give them a definite "No," and I didn't give them a definite "Yes," but I merely played along to find out what was behind their entire scheme, because their influence was rather extensive at that particular time. Of course, since then they have been discharged from the International pay roll, and they are now carrying on their operations in local unions.

The CHAIRMAN. Local unions of the U. A. W.?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they all hold offices now?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. All except Novak. I do not believe Novak is an officer.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you learn from your contacts with them and your conversations with them with reference to the strategy that they sought to put into effect? You say that you did not tell them "no" and you did not tell them "yes"?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, in my mind, I knew where I stood. The Communist Party, of course, has a certain political aim, but they change their tactics from time to time. When one set becomes well known, they change it, and they camouflage it.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Weinstone discuss with you the new change of policy of the Communists under which they sought to penetrate other organizations and seize control?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes; he was very definite about that. I questioned him. I said to him, "There is some confusion in my mind whether you represent the Communist Party or not, because I have heard members of your organization boosting members of other political organizations"; and he explained that there was a new term, internationally—all over the world—and that the American section of the Russian—

The CHAIRMAN. International?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. The Communist International—that they had to adapt that change to America. It was a change in strategy; that the change was, of course, to unite, presumably, with the so-called democratic organizations to fight fascism. I mean that was presumably—that was the basis of his argument. Nevertheless, he expanded on that. Of course, he said that after fascism they will take care of the others, one by one—"liquidate them"—that is the term they use, which means put out of the way or something similar. Nevertheless, he did say that in applying it to America, in the application of that strategy to America, they would send people to whatever political party happened to carry the support of the people. He said: "Today it happens to be the Democratic Party; tomorrow it might be the Republican Party, and day after tomorrow it might be some new party that might rise up on the political horizon." And he did state that although they were sending most of their active political people into the Democratic Party, nevertheless they did send some into the Republican Party; in certain areas where they carried the sentiment of the people,

just in case the switch comes to the Republican Party, naturally, they will have to turn their allegiance—I would not say their allegiance; their support—to that organization. Of course, it is a destructive support. In other words, he outlined that their aim is to disorganize the political organizations and to——

The CHAIRMAN. Bring about splits?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Split up their organizations; demoralize the structure; break down the structure; and as a result the Communist Party would be politically—its weight politically would be that much greater in the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you said that Novak, Anderson, and Ganley were discharged. Why were they discharged—as organizers? They were discharged as organizers?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right. Well, I don't know whether they were discharged directly for propounding certain theories, or whether they were discharged upon a certain technicality. I do know that the pressure which brought about the discharge was the result of people complaining about the wide-open campaign in recruiting members and support for the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke of some company spy that was discovered. Where was that spy working?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. National Automotive Fibers. His name was Arthur Roszel, and he was working for the Corporation Auxiliaries.

The CHAIRMAN. About what time was that?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. This was some time in between—I could not tell you the exact month—between January and March of 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. This company that you talk about is a detective agency, is it not—this auxiliary?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. It is; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, getting back to your own particular local, you said this morning—or did you say? My recollection is that you did—that one of the strategies of the Communists was to raid the treasury of the locals. You explained that to mean that they would seek funds for other causes—Communist causes.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, of course they do not call it raiding.

The CHAIRMAN. No; I understand that.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. They have a more polite term. They call it “contributions.”

The CHAIRMAN. Now, whom would they seek these contributions for?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. They have a number of dummy organizations where they do draw in a lot of innocents on some popular question. It might be against war; it might be against starving children in Spain, or some other cause which appears worthy, and would be worthy if it was carried out to that particular end. Nevertheless, they do draw in a lot of people; and by their superior knowledge of the organizational structure and maneuvers, parliamentary procedure and all those things, they are able to control the national offices of those particular organizations.

In fact, they initiate these movements, and draw in many people who are innocent, many liberal people, and even clergymen behind some cause for peace and some other humanitarian cause; and in these organizations, in speaking to Weinstone and the sectional organizer of

the Communist Party, Miller, that I mentioned before, they brought out the information that these organizations contributed to the Communist Party in the following manner: One would donate to the Daily Worker fund—they have funds once in awhile for the Daily Worker—or some other particular party fund, and in this way the treasury of the Communist Party would be enriched. Also on the staff of these various organizations, on the pay roll of these organizations, they place their people, and their people draw the wages, and naturally contribute a certain portion of those wages to the Communist Party. There are many methods that they use in doing this, in carrying out this raiding, or “contributions,” as they call it.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they get any of these contributions for these various organizations to aid Loyalist Spain?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. You mean did the unions give contributions for that?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Some of them did. Mine did not, but many of them did. Many of them did innocently.

The CHAIRMAN. Describe, will you, just how they do that in these locals?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. The usual procedure is—of course, now the locals are tightening up a little on it—but the usual procedure would be that anybody from an outside organization who wants to take the floor they give him the opportunity, and as soon as he makes an appeal for Spanish children, and what not, then some fellow who has been associated with the Communist Party, or has been falling into line, bobs up on the floor and immediately makes a motion to accept—to make a contribution of so many dollars—and somebody else seconds it immediately. Then that is usually followed by a very emotional speech by somebody else who is affiliated with the group, and the thing is usually carried. After all, the average workingman will certainly contribute from his treasury to help somebody that is suffering, but he does not know—

Mr. MOSIER. But it comes out of the local and goes into some avenue that is dominated by the Communist Party?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

Mr. MOSIER. I do not know whether you know or not, but do you think those funds ever get to the destination that they started for?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, I do happen to have the acquaintance of one man who was very prominently associated with one of their organizations—their stooge organizations. I would not care to mention his name; it would embarrass him at the present time. But, nevertheless, he told me that the funds—he acquainted me with the method by which these funds were used, and that this particular organization which was set up for the purpose of assisting political prisoners somewhere in Europe, he claimed that nine-tenths of the funds were used up in overhead here in America, and the other 10 percent was sent over there, but was never used for the particular cause for which it was designated.

That is an example.

Mr. MOSIER. So that the major portion of the money actually remained in the United States for the use, directly or indirectly, of the Communist Party? In other words, your local union, when it con-

tributed its money, was really contributing money to aid and further the cause of the Communist Party in America?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is the way it should be.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that in these organizations that they set up or control, most of the people in the organizations are innocent?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is my opinion, because I do happen to know many people who belong to these organizations, the women especially. They set up organizations for peace and against war and against fascism. Of course, it is not against war any more now; it is for peace and democracy. But they do appeal to women who have sons, or have lost sons in the war, or do feel that war is a horrible thing—which most of us do—and they play upon their sentiments and do get them into these organizations. I know many women who are perfectly respectable women, even well-to-do women, who do not know anything about communism or any other “ism,” who belong to organizations of this type.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that you also know of instances where they get clergymen and prominent people to sponsor certain meetings and use them as a front?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You know of instances yourself of that kind, where that has been done?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the League for Peace and Democracy one of these front organizations that you are speaking about?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. In my opinion, it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, what do you have to base that opinion upon?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, I have met some of the people who spend their full time on this work, and in discussions with them I became convinced that their political line is that of the Communist Party. I also know some women who are not communistic, have no sympathy for the Communist Party, who became active in this work, really became interested in it, and upon working in the organization found that it was led by elements of the Communist Party. That is where I base my opinion, and also upon conversations with other union men who have much experience in the organizations, and who also have arrived at the same conclusion. I mean, there are many things that we know in the labor movement which we do not have any documentary evidence for, but which we know through constant repetition and coincidence of events; but we do not have the black-and-white proof. But nevertheless we know that definitely.

The CHAIRMAN. There have been quite a number of unauthorized strikes, have there not?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir; there have been quite a number.

The CHAIRMAN. What part have the Communists played in those unauthorized strikes? Have they played a prominent part?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, no doubt; and I know this—in fact, I was threatened with an unauthorized strike in my plant because of the fact that I attacked the Communist Party. I do know that the Communist Party elements have deliberately gone out in many instances—not in all instances; not every unauthorized strike is sponsored by the Communist Party—but in many instances they have done that to embarrass the leadership. For example, if some organizer signed a con-

tract with the corporation, and the contract was fairly good, gained a lot of concessions for the men and women in the plant, the organizer naturally would gain a certain amount of popularity for his good work. The Communist Party, on the other hand, in order to discredit him and break down his popularity, would embarrass him by staging strikes in isolated departments where they have control, and thereby tying up the plant and creating confusion and making it difficult and embarrassing for the organizer, because the organizer is definitely responsible for the carrying out of the contract for which he negotiated.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if the Communists have control of some department, can they bring on a general strike by their actions?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. It is possible, and I believe it has been done in some cases, in an individual department where no grievance existed, and the strike was called by two or three men, or two or three men would pull the switches in one department, throwing 20 or 30 thousand people out of work throughout the country, which is a crime not only against the workers in the plant and against the union, but also economically it is a crime against the country.

Nevertheless, I would like to qualify this. In the general unauthorized sit-down strikes, in some cases there has been evidence that companies have encouraged them during the slack season—anti-union employers. It is not predominant. In other words, this exists in only rare instances, but nevertheless it has happened, where during a period of economic decline, when the manufacturer can afford to shut down his plant, some procompany person will sponsor such a strike. In most instances, of course, the manufacturers do not use such tactics. They live up to their contracts. But there are some instances we know of where that was deliberately done, in order to weaken or smash the local union in that particular plant.

The CHAIRMAN. When a sit-down strike occurs, does that afford any opportunity to Communists to propagandize among the men?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, during the sit-down strikes of 1936 and 1937, which lasted for some duration of time, the major press carried publicity which was opposed to the strikers, and the strikers were boycotting—you might as well say boycotting—the papers. They would not read the papers, because they carried all kinds of stories about their particular action, and the Communist Party—of course, you must realize that to a man sitting in the plant it gets very monotonous sitting there 24 hours a day without anything to do, and he will eagerly grab anything to read. I know some men who would not look at a Communist paper for days, and finally they would be so bored with sitting down in the plant that they would read this stuff, and the Communist Party gained some adherents through these methods. There are always some men who will fall for a good political line. You will interpret my remarks properly, “political line”—capital “L.”

The CHAIRMAN. Now, what is the difference between the objectives of legitimate trade-unionists—you gentlemen who are in the trade-union movement—what is the difference between your objectives, what you are trying to do and what the Communists are seeking to do by their labor activities?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Generally speaking, the objective of legitimate trade-unionists in a legitimate trade-union is to better the condition

of the working men and women in the plant by means of an understanding with the employer, if at all possible. In other words, a legitimate union is run on the basis of gaining an equitable share of the wealth that is produced and under fair conditions negotiated, in a friendly spirit, across the table, if at all possible. Of course, there are instances when labor must strike, has to strike; but that is the last resort of a legitimate, respectable, bona fide union.

On the other hand, the aims of the Communist Party toward the union are not so much to gain economic benefits for the employees as to use it as a political weapon. That is a general statement; I mean, use it as a political weapon for their own benefit. Of course, there are many little side dishes in the union; I mean there is the treasury. But the main objective of the Communist Party, as outlined at least by Weinstone, is the political significance of a union. There is the political pressure that can be applied through control of a union. That seemed to be the main thing on his mind, and, after all, he is one of the biggest men in the Communist Party. He is one of the big brains behind the Communist Party; is supposed to be one of their most intelligent men, and he is a very smart man. I will give him that credit. But he is using it in the wrong direction.

The CHAIRMAN. What part does the betterment of working conditions play in their scheme?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. The Communist Party?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, originally, in organizing the union, naturally in gaining control of the particular local union, they have to concentrate on bettering the conditions of the workers; at least putting forward the slogans of bettering the conditions of the workers. But after they secure control of the local union, the usual procedure is to build up a rigid machine; that is, build up a system of voting, control, stewards, propaganda, information, and all the other avenues that can be used in the union to influence people. They build up a rigid machine. From then on the union is used mainly for political purposes.

Mr. MASON. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we cannot clarify that by saying that the Communists work in labor organizations by using desirable and attractive objectives to gain control of the organization, and after gaining control discarding those objectives and doing everything they can to bring about chaos for political purposes?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct. That is another way of putting it, briefly.

Mr. MOSIER. I am interested in knowing about the United Automobile Workers. Most of the members of the United Automobile Workers are in Michigan, are they not?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir; about 70 percent of them.

Mr. MOSIER. And what other States do they go over into?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Wisconsin, Ohio, and Indiana.

Mr. MOSIER. Then it would be Michigan with about 70 percent and the other 30 percent Ohio, Indiana, and Wisconsin?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. And New York State.

Mr. MOSIER. And New York State. And approximately how large a membership is there in the United Automobile Workers?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, it is difficult to tell. It runs somewhere between 300,000 and 400,000.

Mr. MOSIER. Between three and four hundred thousand?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And therefore it is one of the great unions of the world, is it not?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. And you have been closely associated in that work, and not only you—that is true, is it not—not only you, but others in the work have had a great deal of trouble with the Communists?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is true.

I would like to state this: That in the beginning of our organization many people who are not Communists fell into the mistake of giving the Communist Party elements full leeway. That is, they welcomed any cooperation. They were so broadly democratic that they eliminated democracy, if you know what I mean. You can be so democratic, or extreme—the extreme of democracy is anarchy. In other words, instead of running a union along the lines as set down by the usual democratic organization, which has discipline—you must have discipline in a democracy in order to make it work—the organization first grew up, and naturally it did grow up that way, because it grew so fast that the discipline was not there. Therefore the Communist Party, which had only a small number of people comparatively, worked together in unison, and they did manage to secure control of certain sections of the organization. Of course, in time the responsible union element comes to the front and begins to combat any attempt, whether it be the Communist Party or any other enemy of the union inside the ranks of the membership of the union, and fights them on the basis of a program of responsible unionism.

The CHAIRMAN. Right at that point, the matter is still in doubt as to which element will prevail, is it not?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, I would not want to give my opinion here, because, in the first place, it would be only guessing. It is difficult to say—

Mr. MOZIER. But you are in the middle of the fight now?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I am in the middle; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you say that the Communists control a majority of the members of the executive board of the U. A. W.?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Well, I would not say that. To tell you the truth, I don't know. But I will tell you that if sometime in the near future, after this testimony, if I happen to lose my position, then you will be able to draw a more logical conclusion from that.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we certainly hope that your courageous and fearless conduct in coming before this committee and giving us the benefit of the facts will not in anywise jeopardize your position with the union. We would hate to think that any punitive measures would be taken against you simply because you, as a patriotic citizen, are seeking to give this committee the benefit of what facts and information you have.

Mr. MOSIER. About the U. A. W.; they run over into Ohio. Where are most of them centered in Ohio?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Cleveland, Norwood, and Cincinnati; mostly in the Cleveland area.

Mr. MOSIER. In the Cleveland area, Norwood and Cincinnati; Norwood is a suburb of Cincinnati?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. How about Toledo?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. And Toledo; I beg your pardon. Toledo is also a large center.

Mr. MOSIER. You do not take into the U. A. W. the glass workers?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. No; unless there happens to be one department in the shop which manufactures glass. If it is a separate industry, we do not take it in. That is under another union.

Mr. MOSIER. I had in mind the big Toledo plants, or the big Toledo glass unions, and I wondered if they were associated at all with the Automobile Workers' union.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. No.

The CHAIRMAN. In some testimony given to the committee in Detroit, an accusation was made against two individuals. Information has come to the Chair that the accusations were unfounded, or at least that there was room to believe that they were unfounded. One individual was Mr. Davidow, who is a well-known attorney in Detroit.

How do you spell his name?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. D-a-v-i-d-o-w.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his first name?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Larry.

The CHAIRMAN. What can you give us on that? We want to give you an opportunity to give us the facts.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Those of us who have stood for responsible unionism in the U. A. W. were very much aggravated by those accusations. Larry Davidow is a labor attorney for the U. A. W. who has been in the front, fighting the Communist Party, to free the union of communism. In fact, he has been vilified and he has been called every name under the sun for fighting the obstructive tactics of the Communist Party in the union movement for some years.

Many of our members, when they heard that Larry Davidow was being accused of being communistic, or having communistic tendencies—the tendency was to blame the Dies Committee for this testimony. They considered that such testimony does not harm the Communist Party; it helps it because in the mind of the average citizen who knows Larry Davidow, the tendency will be to discredit that testimony. Some people may even say my testimony, since it has been presented before the same committee—they might be prejudiced against this particular testimony, and therefore it aids rather than hinders the Communist Party, since it is recognized that Larry Davidow is in the front fighting the Communist Party. He does not belong to any political party.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the information the Chair has received from a number of sources in relation to Mr. Davidow.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I do know he is a person of high character and has stood against the principles of the Communist Party, very much so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has also received similar information in relation to Rabbi Frahm.

I believe those accusations against Rabbi Frahm and Mr. Davidow were made by Mr. Reynolds, in Detroit.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. He did not accuse them of being members of the Communist Party.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. With communistic inclinations.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know, as a matter of fact, that Rabbi Frahm does not have communistic tendencies?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I do know; I know he is a person of high character, and also he is rabbi in a temple of a very wealthy congregation, who are very much opposed to the Communist Party or anything associated with it, and he has reflected that particular type of congregation throughout Detroit, especially among the Jewish people.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have that information, and I may say for your benefit that we will welcome any one who will come before the committee and tell us what the facts are. The committee has extended the invitation repeatedly, and we will give full latitude and opportunity for anyone to appear under oath and deny any testimony that some witness has given before this committee.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I would like to state, in order to avoid confusion as to the intention of my testimony, that I was subpoenaed and asked to testify and answer whatever questions were asked me and give whatever information I had to dispose of; and I would also like to state that my intentions are not to harm the unions. In other words, by the essence or the weight of my own testimony, I do not intend it as antiunion propaganda, but as a means of benefiting the union, of clarifying and assisting to eliminate the forces which threaten to destroy it.

Mr. MASON. Would you not say, sir, that testimony to bring out the facts of the subversive work of the Communists among legitimate labor unions is the one thing necessary to do to make permanent and make effective regular union activities?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is true; I agree with you.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any other information that would be important for the committee to have that you can give, that you have not given.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I have seen so much in a short period of time that it is difficult for me—I mean I have experienced a lot insofar as fighting the Communist Party is concerned, that it would take me probably weeks to bring out all the details. I think I have brought out the essential points from whatever information I have acquired. There are a lot of details and personal matters, I mean insofar as personalities are concerned, which I could probably continue bringing out for a long time, if I began to concentrate on that particular side of the question, but I think most of the essential points have been covered.

The CHAIRMAN. With reference to the strategy of the Communists, among their different methods, is it, or is it not, a fact that they seek to designate everyone opposed to them as pro-Fascist or illiberal?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Their tendency is to borrow their terms from their center, from Soviet Russia. Whatever names they give their opponents there they call them here. They call them spies, Fascists, mad dogs of fascism, Trotskyites, and what-not. I have been four different things every week, for months running; I mean every month they would have a new name.

Mr. MOSIER. For you?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. For me and for the others who oppose them. They call me everything under the sun, but that does not disturb us.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say, from your own knowledge and experience, that the Communists in the United States are under the control of the Third Internationale?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. They make no denial of that fact?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. They make no denial of it; they admit that.

The CHAIRMAN. They follow the instructions they get from Russia with regard to methods and tactics?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct, they admit that. That is known generally; their allegiance is outside of this country.

Mr. MOSIER. What part does Phil Raymond play in the Michigan area now?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. He has been very quiet, insofar as the union movement is concerned. He has been known as a Communist so long before the U. A. W. came into existence that it has been impractical for the Communist Party to use him.

Mr. MOSIER. Who succeeded Weinstone?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Giebert.

Mr. MOSIER. Where did he come from?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. He came from New York.

Mr. MOSIER. He was transferred from New York to Detroit?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Of course, the situation is that Weinstone made some very bad mistakes, and he was punished for it.

Mr. MOSIER. He was sent to Siberia, by being called to New York?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. Of course, your experience has been mostly with the U. A. W. You have not followed their tactics into anything else, such as schools?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. In the union they inject many of the political questions, and in combating them we have to find out actually what they are. Whatever political matters they inject into the union ultimately we have to combat them, but they do not bring out their entire philosophy into the union, all at one time. We learn as we go along.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you learned anything with reference to their activities in the schools?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. To tell you the truth, no, I do not know much about that. I have read something about it, but I do not know much about that. I do not think there is much of that in the Detroit public schools, up to the university. I do not know what it is in Wayne University, say, and the other universities in Detroit. But up to the high school, I do not think there is much, at least, it cannot be compared to New York.

The CHAIRMAN. What part did the fact that the Communists were well trained and good agitators and leaders play in the fact that they seized control of many strategic positions, like organizers?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That made all the difference in the world. During the first organizational days, when the U. A. W. was first formed, and the men were beginning to recognize that unionism was the thing they needed, they came in by the hundreds; the automobile industry was made up of men, primarily, who had never been in any union before, and who were completely inexperienced, not knowing even how to make a motion on the floor.

Now they are much more experienced than they were before. They are learning.

These members of the Communist Party knew how to speak; some of them had extensive soap-box experience, and experience in other organizations, and they took advantage of this fact. It is very simple for a man who understands public speaking and the parliamentary rules to control a meeting of uninitiated people. It is very simple. I have found that out myself, that it is very simple.

The CHAIRMAN. Did not the Communist Party have a workers' school in Detroit, where they trained people?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I understand that they did; in fact, I know they did, because some of these Communists have been going around boasting of the fact that they were trained. Although I do not know how much of a school they had in Detroit, I do know many of them have been sent to New York City to study.

The CHAIRMAN. To study in the Communist schools in New York City?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. In the fight that you and other responsible labor leaders are making to rid the unions of the Communist influence, what is your opinion as to the success of that movement? Do you think you are going to be successful, or would that be too much of a guess?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I am convinced we will be successful, that we will build a responsible union without these disruptive elements. We have talked to them, asked them, and pleaded with them, and requested them to conduct themselves as union men. We try to be very democratic, but we have found, as other leaders have found in older unions, that it does not work. They do not believe in democracy and they do not recognize it, and they have contempt for those who practice it.

Mr. MASON. Nor do they believe in unionism as we understand real unionism.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they had much success in penetrating craft unions?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. In the discussion with Weinstone, he brought out the fact that they switched their concentration, upon instructions, from the American Federation of Labor to the C. I. O., because it was a new field, where their service would be perhaps more welcome. The thing is that the—I do not know whether you gentlemen realize the situation that existed in the organization that grew up suddenly; we found ourselves without organizers.

In the city of Detroit we took inventory and we could only find four or five capable organizers not associated with the Communist Party, and we were helpless. All we could hope for was consolidation of the union and increased experience of the membership, and out of that would develop men of ability who would be able to build a responsible union which would be a permanent structure in the American scene, and not a destructive one.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you find a strong desire among the members of the U. A. W. to oust Communists and rid the whole union of that influence?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Very definitely.

The CHAIRMAN. Can that desire be realized if the international union fails to cooperate? What I mean is that, in spite of your biggest efforts, if the international officers failed to cooperate with you, what then?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. I do not know whether they will not.

The CHAIRMAN. I am assuming that they would not.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. If they would not, they would not have a union, without the membership. The membership has, after all, something to say about it. Our members have learned something about these very forces, and they are learning to assert themselves.

Mr. MOSIER. And I suppose you teach them and encourage them to assert themselves?

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee wishes to express its deep appreciation to you and express the hope that other responsible labor leaders will follow your example and come before this committee and give us the facts. We want the facts from the standpoint of the union. We have been seeking in every way in the world to get responsible union leaders to come before the committee and tell us the truth, because all the committee is concerned with is the facts. We do not want anything developed that is not true; we want a correct picture to go out to the country.

We want to be of assistance and aid to the legitimate organizations that want to rid themselves of the Communist influence.

So the committee feels very grateful to you, even in spite of the fact that you were subpoenaed. But even when a subpoena is issued, that does not always make a witness willing to tell the full facts. So you are to be commended for your patriotic attitude, and we hope no punitive measures are taken against you; and if they are, I wish you would communicate that fact to the committee, so we will know how genuine is the desire to rid the union of the Communist influence, as well as other organizations.

Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will adjourn for the day at this time and meet again at 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Thereupon the committee adjourned to meet tomorrow, Tuesday, November 15, 1938, at 10:30 a. m.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1938

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE TO
INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. We will have Mr. Metcalfe for a little while this morning before we get to the mayor of Akron.

STATEMENT OF JOHN C. METCALFE

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Metcalfe, the Chair instructed you some time ago to investigate a number of organizations in the United States that are disseminating racial and religious hatred through pamphlets and publications, and other avenues of information. Is that a fact?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You were instructed to take with you an official reporter and interview the officers and directors of some of those organizations for the purpose of affording them an opportunity to present their side of the matter to the committee, and to request them to give you full information with regard to their activities?

Mr. METCALFE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a fact, is it not, that prior to that the committee had information of publications issued by those organizations?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, we had in our possession leaflets, pamphlets, and booklets that were distributed by those organizations throughout the country?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it, or not, the fact that this antiracial and anti-religious propaganda has been and is being distributed on a wide-scale basis throughout the whole country?

Mr. METCALFE. It is a fact that this propaganda is being distributed on a wide basis throughout the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. And some of it comes directly from Germany?

Mr. METCALFE. Some of it comes direct from Germany—that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. It is mailed directly to people in the United States?

Mr. METCALFE. I might explain it in this way: Some of it is printed in the United States and then shipped to Germany. Then it is re-shipped from Germany back into the United States in bundles, which contain racial and religious attacks, and other literature and nazi propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN. We have had that before the committee.

Mr. METCALFE. It is shipped in packages.

The CHAIRMAN. We had some of the packages before the committee. But, in addition to the propaganda coming directly from foreign countries, the great bulk of it is being distributed by certain organizations within the United States.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you interviewed those various organizations.

Mr. METCALFE. As many as I could contact.

The CHAIRMAN. How many did you actually contact?

Mr. METCALFE. Fifty-three so far.

The CHAIRMAN. Was an official reporter present during every interview?

Mr. METCALFE. On all occasions a court reporter was accompanying me.

The CHAIRMAN. You stated to the officers, or whoever was in charge of the organization, that the committee wanted to afford them opportunity to explain their activities without the need of coming here, or to explain why they were distributing this propaganda throughout the country.

Mr. METCALFE. When informed that we were in possession of certain literature, booklets, and so forth—however, in the face of such evidence, we were making no charges, but our call was purely of an informative nature, and to give them an opportunity to express their position with reference to this particular activity, as to their plans of operation, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. As to the reporter's names, did you have more than one reporter?

Mr. METCALFE. We had a different reporter in every city.

The CHAIRMAN. In any instance, did any of the officers, directors, or anyone in charge of those organizations that you called upon give you any information with reference to who was contributing to them, or who the contributors were, or anything of that sort?

Mr. METCALFE. Those organizations—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I mean specifically, did they give any names?

Mr. METCALFE. They would not give the names. We wanted them to show the books, records, lists of members, contributors, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they admit the issue of the pamphlets and literature you have referred to?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; they admitted they were issuing this propaganda, and admitted that the documents we had in our possession came from them and were originated by them.

The CHAIRMAN. You have stenographic reports as to all of these organizations?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. At some time, probably during the latter part of this week, we want to go into that matter, because the evidence that has reached the Chair is that, while we talk about foreign countries, the same thing is about to happen here, so far as class hatred, race hatred, and religious hatreds are concerned. That becomes particularly important in view of what is happening across the water. We see the barbaric treatment that is being accorded to those who are in a helpless minority, and we know from the history of those countries that class hatred always precedes racial and religious hatred in those countries.

Now, you had occasion particularly to go to the city of Pittsburgh, did you not?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. To investigate the activities of the Silver Shirts?

Mr. METCALFE. The Silver Shirt organization in Pittsburgh.

The CHAIRMAN. In that area?

Mr. METCALFE. In that area.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you make a very careful investigation there?

Mr. METCALFE. As far as we could in the limited amount of time. I believe we made a rather thorough investigation of the situation with reference to the Silver Shirts' subversive activities in the Pittsburgh area.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you contact businessmen and the chief of police there?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And all the authorities you could talk to.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; I did.

The CHAIRMAN. This Silver Shirt organization is one of the 53 organizations that you have investigated.

Mr. METCALFE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. There has come to the attention of the Chair the fact that this propaganda, or racial and religious propaganda and class hatred, are being disseminated throughout the country, and we are afraid that there is more or less interrelationship between what is going on here and what is going on in other countries.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; the organizations in this country are following more or less the procedure that has been followed in Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. As to racial hatred.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And in class hatred they follow the same tactics that they do in Russia.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; so far as the promotion of national socialism is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. So there is evidence that we will bring out, is there not, showing that there is an interrelationship between this whole thing in this country and foreign countries, and that some of the propaganda used in the United States is borrowed directly from foreign countries, in some instances using the same phaseology: Is that a fact?

Mr. METCALFE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Even taking the speeches of certain leaders in Europe, and using practically the same statements under the names of American propagandists?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; they even go so far as to use on their literature the swastika emblem in some cases.

The CHAIRMAN. On the literature of some of the Fascist organizations they use the swastika. They use it on their letterheads.

Mr. METCALFE. On their literature; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When you were in Pittsburgh, what did you find with reference to a man by the name of Charles Bruce Swift?

Mr. METCALFE. A man by the name of Charles Bruce Swift resides at 275 Southern Avenue, Pittsburgh. His post-office box is 1853, and his telephone is Hemlock 2796.

The CHAIRMAN. You talked to Mr. Swift, did you not?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You also talked to a number of businessmen with reference to Mr. Swift's activities?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Swift is with the Naval Intelligence Service, is he not?

Mr. METCALFE. He is a naval intelligence officer of the United States Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. Preparatory to your statement, is it a fact that you have conferred with the Office of Naval Intelligence and given them all the information that you have with reference to this man and his activities?

Mr. METCALFE. I am now conferring with the Navy Department. I have talked to the Chief of the Naval Intelligence Service.

The CHAIRMAN. You have conferred with the chief of that bureau of the Navy Department of the United States?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; and other officers.

The CHAIRMAN. You contacted a number of businessmen who do not want their names revealed?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They made you promise not to tell their names.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But you are giving those names to the Naval Intelligence Office.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to make that clear so that it will be understood that those names will be given to the Office of Naval Intelligence. Why did they not want their names revealed to this committee?

Mr. METCALFE. For fear of reprisals against them by certain subversive leaders in the Pittsburgh area, or leaders of organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. When you talked with them, what did you learn from your conversations with those businessmen concerning Mr. Swift? Can you give us some of the facts?

Mr. METCALFE. I learned that Mr. Swift is a United States Naval Intelligence officer, and that he is also organizer and leader of the Silver Shirts in the Pittsburgh area; that he has in his possession large Naval Intelligence files, and that he also obtains information and cooperation from the Military Intelligence in Pittsburgh. I learned that he has access to information of the Military Intelligence Service, and that he has built up, aside from that, a sort of espionage organization of his own among citizens of a patriotic character who apparently have been duped into believing that in serving Mr. Swift they are serving the United States Naval Intelligence Service;

whereas Mr. Swift actually is engaged in un-American subversive activities. This had not been known to the United States Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he in the Regular service?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; he served in the World War, in the Navy, and it was about 2 years ago, or not quite 2 years ago, that he took over Naval Intelligence work which was formerly done under the direction of Commander Dohrman—Commander H. D. Dohrman. Commander Dohrman was the chief Naval Intelligence officer for more than 26 years in the Pittsburgh area. He died at the naval hospital in Pittsburgh, or the veterans' hospital, of a complication of illnesses, on the afternoon of May 5, 1938, after having been there for a period of some 10 days.

The CHAIRMAN. Going back to Mr. Swift; you say he is an organizer or officer of the Silver Shirts?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you seen the literature and pamphlets issued by the Silver Shirts?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; I have seen a good deal of that literature.

The CHAIRMAN. How does that literature compare with the German Nazi ideology? You have also seen a good deal of the official publications of the Nazi government, have you not?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What I want to ask you is if they adopt practically the same strategy that the Nazis have.

Mr. METCALFE. Definitely so. The literature is very similar. Perhaps a good illustration would be to point out that William Dudley Pelley, who is the chief of the Silver Shirts, and whose national headquarters are at Asheville, N. C., admits that the Silver Shirts cooperate with them.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you know that? Has he given you those facts? You say that he admits it. Did he admit it to you?

Mr. METCALFE. He has admitted it in his own literature. I was also at the national headquarters.

The CHAIRMAN. You called on him?

Mr. METCALFE. I did not speak to Mr. Pelley. He was out of town, but I spoke to Mr. Cummings, the editor of his magazine. We have in this evidence as to the Silver Shirt organization copies of the magazine called "Liberation," and the statements I give now are taken from that publication, copies of which have been filed with the committee. Mr. Pelley points out, for instance, that while the Silver Shirts and members of the German-American Bund attend similar affairs, or the same affairs, and give the impression of overlapping, it does not necessarily endorse everything that the bund does. However, he claims that he is the first man in America who has advocated the same principles as set forth by Hitler in "Mein Kampf."

The CHAIRMAN. He has stated in his own publication that he is the first man in America who has advocated the principles set forth in Hitler's "Mein Kampf."

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the activities of Mr. Swift that you know about?

Mr. METCALFE. On or about October 1 of this year Mr. Swift went around the city of Pittsburgh and talked to a number of business

men in Pittsburgh. He told them that there was to be a secret meeting, or a sort of vigilante meeting, and he was calling on those business men to come to the meeting. He flashed a Naval Intelligence card, and, of course, some businessmen seeing that card felt that it was, perhaps, their duty to attend this meeting, even though they did not know what the meeting was all about. When that meeting was held at the Pittsburgh Athletic Association headquarters, they found that it was a meeting of Silver Shirts. Mr. Swift, who was presiding, had brought to Pittsburgh the man speaker of the affair, Roy Zachary. He is the field marshal of the Silver Shirts. Zachary is the same man who has been going all over the United States instructing the Silver Shirts to arm for the impending revolution. That was heard again this same night. He did the same things. He gave, of course, a violent antiracial, antireligious, and antigovernment attack, much to the astonishment of many businessmen.

The CHAIRMAN. You talked to most of those businessmen?

Mr. METCALFE. I talked to as many businessmen as I could.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have their names?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are prepared to submit those names to the Navy Department?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. I also talked with Swift, who admitted the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. He admitted them?

Mr. METCALFE. He admitted them in the presence of the son of the chief of police of Pittsburgh.

The CHAIRMAN. The son of the chief of police went with you when you talked with him?

Mr. METCALFE. He was assigned to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Upon instructions of the Chair that you were to take an impartial witness to be present at the talk.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. His name is McQuaide.

The CHAIRMAN. He is the son of the chief of police of Pittsburgh?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his full name?

Mr. METCALFE. I have it here somewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. While you are looking for that, will you tell me what is Swift's rank in the Navy?

Mr. METCALFE. He was, I understand from him, only a sailor in the Navy during the World War. He was not a commissioned officer at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he commissioned now, or what is his rank?

Mr. METCALFE. He is a Naval Intelligence officer.

The CHAIRMAN. Of what rank?

Mr. METCALFE. He was appointed by Captain Puleston, who for many years was Chief of the Naval Intelligence Service at Washington. About a year ago he was replaced by Admiral Ralston Holmes, who is now in charge.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his rank? Is he a captain?

Mr. METCALFE. He is only known as a Naval Intelligence officer, or Reserve officer.

The CHAIRMAN. In this meeting that you were telling about, Swift made a speech, you say. Tell us about the meeting.

Mr. METCALFE. There were about 40 businessmen there. The meeting took place on October 4. It was kept so secret that even the secretary of the Pittsburgh Athletic Association has since denied that it ever took place. However, investigation by the American Legion substantiated the fact that the meeting did take place. The American Legion was particularly interested in this case because it so happened that Mr. Swift aside from being the Naval Intelligence officer and organizer for the Silver Shirts was also chairman of the Constitutional Defense Committee of the American Legion for Allegheny County. The American Legion had no knowledge of the fact that Mr. Swift had called this meeting, or was planning to call a number of other meetings under the so-called auspices of the American Legion.

The CHAIRMAN. When they found out about it, what did they do?

Mr. METCALFE. They were very frankly shocked. They did not believe it until they began an investigation in the American Legion.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they put a stop to it?

Mr. METCALFE. They have not been talking in Pittsburgh.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this man Swift in the regular service, or is he a Reserve?

Mr. METCALFE. He is a Naval Intelligence officer, according to my information.

The CHAIRMAN. Does Mr. McQuaide, who went with you, hold any official position in the police department of Pittsburgh?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; he is a police officer. His father is chief of police. The chief of police, Mr. Frank McQuaide, stated to me that he knew Swift, and that he had at the same time believed there was something very strange about Mr. Swift's activities. He stated to me this, that about 4 months ago Lieutenant Baird, of the county police, who is the officer in command of the Liberty Tube, came to see him about Swift. Baird, who was formerly a police officer of the city, said that a neighbor of Swift "Would like me to give Swift a civic police badge." He explained that Swift was a Naval Intelligence officer and that in that capacity such a badge would give him protection against snooping policemen who might desire to interfere with Swift's activities at some time or other. Chief McQuaide stated a few days later that Swift called personally on him and requested a police badge, and that during this conversation he displayed his Naval Intelligence credentials.

The CHAIRMAN. You are referring now to a conversation between you and the chief of police?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The stenographer's report contains the conversation, and Mr. McQuaide can make a statement.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. McQuaide made that statement to me for the benefit of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. We can have Mr. McQuaide here. You say that at this meeting Mr. Swift was present and Mr. Zachary spoke, and what you are saying is based upon reports given to you by those businessmen.

Mr. METCALFE. By the businessmen, by the chief of police, and by Mr. Swift himself.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he admit that Mr. Zachary spoke at the time Zachary denounced everyone of certain conservative industrialists and liberal politicians?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Adolph Hitler was the only one he endorsed.

Mr. METCALFE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he say anything in this meeting about instructing members to buy guns and ammunition to prepare for the impending revolution?

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Swift told me that Mr. Zachary, in his talk, apparently had forgotten to mention that; so he, Swift, then drew a crude sketch of the President, with a pistol pointing at the President, and shoved this piece of paper before Zachary, so as to remind him to tell about the time the alleged Communists were supposed to have threatened to kill the President. This was to call his attention to the fact that he also wanted to talk about the instructions to the Silver Shirts to arm.

The CHAIRMAN. While Zachary was speaking, Swift reminded him through that cartoon or drawing of the incident in which Zachary was accused of having advocated the assassination of the President.

Mr. METCALFE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, do you have a postcard signed by Mr. Swift?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I was sent to a Pittsburgh businessman who attended this meeting.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not want the name of this businessman mentioned.

Mr. METCALFE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. This postcard went through the mails and was received.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; by a businessman in Pittsburgh.

The CHAIRMAN. I will read from this postcard. It is dated October 11, 1937, and I read from it as follows:

Have not been able to get to my desk until today, due to assignments mostly out of city, to answer a stack of inquiries and comments from those persons at meeting. Verily those persons have been doing some tall and fancy thinking in the meantime. This in addition to making out reports of my investigation. Soon I will be caught up and will drop in and call your invitation for a luncheon together. It ought to be interesting? "Und how."

That is German for "and how."

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It goes on to say:

The wigwam is at 725 Southern Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., phone Hemlock 2796.

How does that compare with the date of the meeting at which Zachary spoke?

Mr. METCALFE. The meeting took place on the fourth, and this card is dated and mailed to one of the businessmen present on October 11, 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you talk to the widow of Commander Dohrman?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; I spoke with her.

The CHAIRMAN. What did she tell you with reference to Mr. Swift?

Mr. METCALFE. Mrs. Dohrman, who resides at 420 South Graham Street, stated that shortly after her husband's death her intuition or something prompted her to destroy any papers which she considered of a confidential nature with reference to her late husband's Naval Intelligence work. She stated that the thought of forwarding the papers, clippings, documents, or whatever there might be, to Washington, of interest to Washington naval officials, never occurred to her. She explained that all of her wedded life she had made it her business to mind her own business and never to interfere in her husband's affairs whenever they concerned Navy or official matters, and she explained that therefore she knew very little about the commander's Government activities. She stated that there were only threads of official information in her mind when she set out to tear up and burn up any papers that she might consider of value. She recalled that her husband had been appointed to Naval Intelligence work by Captain Puleston, and that the same Navy official had appointed her husband's successor during 1937, a year or so before the commander's death.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, let us not get too much. We can have her here as a witness, can we not?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; we can.

The CHAIRMAN. To verify anything. But what did she tell you with reference to the file that Mr. Swift had?

Mr. METCALFE. Well, she said that the entire file had been turned over by Commander Dohrman to Mr. Swift in a series of visits that he had made to their home; that he had taken a part of the file at a time; that, so far as she knew, he now had that file in his possession. And Mr. Swift later, in my conversation with him, admitted that he has the Navy Intelligence file in his possession.

The CHAIRMAN. He admitted that in your presence?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And in the presence of the police?

Mr. METCALFE. And in the presence of the police; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Swift make any admission to you with reference to his future plans of secret meetings?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes. Mr. Swift stated that he was laying plans for a series of secret meetings for Pittsburgh businessmen, and he said that these gatherings would feature various subversive leaders.

The CHAIRMAN. Various leaders; the word "subversive" is your own word?

Mr. METCALFE. No; it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it his word?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. He used the word "subversive"?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Whom did he name?

Mr. METCALFE. He said his next speaker would be George E. Deatherage. Deatherage is the chief of the Knights of the White Camellia, which has its national headquarters at St. Albans, W. Va., which is just outside of Charleston, W. Va.

The CHAIRMAN. He is the chief of the Knights of the White Camellia?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. That is also one of the organizations in that list which we have investigated, and we have talked to Mr. Deatherage. Mr. Deatherage was just one of the speakers in this coming series. There were others.

The CHAIRMAN. There were others listed?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; he mentioned them.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, we cannot go into these 53 organizations today. You are not quite prepared for that yet, are you?

Mr. METCALFE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But I want to ask you a few questions before we get to the next witness. We have had a great deal of evidence of the spread of class hatred in the United States, largely promoted by Communists and Communist sympathizers. We have also had considerable evidence of the dissemination of racial and religious intolerance in this country, have we not?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have made a rather extensive investigation into that field, have you not?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It has carried you to a great many parts of the country?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. As a result of your investigation—absolute facts that you yourself have found—do you find a systematic attempt to spread racial and religious intolerance throughout the United States?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you find that racial and religious intolerance is increasing in certain areas of the country?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you find that these organizations that you have investigated, and which we will hear from later, are actively engaged in promoting racial and religious intolerance?

Mr. METCALFE. I would say, for the most part, that those 53 are actually engaging in promotion of racial and religious intolerance.

The CHAIRMAN. How are they doing that?

Mr. METCALFE. By printing and distribution of literature and propaganda of various kinds, and by speeches and meetings that they hold.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you have secured a great deal of this literature, and a great many of these pamphlets and leaflets, have you not?

Mr. METCALFE. About a suit case full.

The CHAIRMAN. So that—this is my own observation—the alarming thing about it is that we see these Communist front organizations and sympathizers on the one hand spreading class hatred wherever they can throughout the country; then we find the rise of the same thing with reference to religious and racial propaganda throughout the country.

Mr. MASON. By the Silver Shirts and the German Bund and the fascistic groups.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. MASON. As opposite to the communistic groups that are spreading class prejudice.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right; yes.

Now, in your conversations with these officers in these organizations, what excuse do they usually give for distributing this propaganda? In other words, asking you a leading question, is it or is it not a fact that the invariable excuse is that on account of the rise of communism in this country it has to be combatted, and they are using the method of racial and religious intolerance to combat communism? Is that one of the excuses?

Mr. METCALFE. I would say that they set up Nazi and Fascist props under an anti-Communist smoke screen.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, how does that compare with the same thing that was done in Germany, Italy, and other countries?

Mr. METCALFE. Well, the anti-racial and the anti-religious activities are usually not the end, but the means to an end.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand, but I mean the tactics.

Mr. METCALFE. The tactics are identically the same.

The CHAIRMAN. And foreign governments, like the Nazis in Germany, are actively participating in the United States in the racial and religious campaign, are they not?

Mr. METCALFE. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that demonstrated by the fact that this committee has secured bundles of literature shipped from Germany direct to citizens of the United States?

Mr. METCALFE. That statement can be made and established by documentary evidence in the possession of this committee, and I do not believe it could be successfully refuted by anyone.

The CHAIRMAN. And, of course, the same tactics are pursued by Russia in sending propaganda and agents into the United States to work through Communist front organizations.

Now, as soon as you can prepare your material on these 53 organizations, the Chair wants you to be prepared to testify with reference to them. You are not bringing in any organization, are you, where you do not have their own pamphlets and literature showing the type of propaganda they are engaged in?

Mr. METCALFE. Pamphlets, literature, or correspondence as evidence to show that they are active in these things.

The CHAIRMAN. How many organizations would you say are using the swastika on their literature?

Mr. METCALFE. I would not be in a position to make an accurate statement. We have a list, for instance, of several hundred organizations, but we have been able in this short time to get to only about one-fourth of that group. They are so widely scattered around the country that it is physically impossible to get to all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. So that your testimony with respect to these organizations, first, will be predicated upon their own literature, their own pamphlets and publications; and, second, upon their admission to you, in the presence of a reporter who took it down, of the fact that they did distribute the pamphlets and literature; is that not true?

Mr. METCALFE. Some of them openly predict that there will be a Fascist government in the United States before very long; and they have made those statements in the presence of the court reporter and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Metcalfe, the Chair hopes that you will get this information all in order as quickly as possible, because it is of

vital interest to the country when we find that while a great many people are worried about Germany and about what is happening in Russia, the same attempt is being made in the United States, by both of those countries, to spread class, religious, and racial hatred throughout the land.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that will be all we will ask of you for the time being.

Mr. Sparks, will you please come around and be sworn?

TESTIMONY OF C. NELSON SPARKS

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mosier will examine you, and the Chair wants to caution you, Mr. Sparks, to confine your statements to absolute facts that you yourself know.

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. Sparks, will you please state your full name?

Mr. SPARKS. C. Nelson Sparks—Charles Nelson Sparks.

Mr. MOSIER. How do you spell Sparks?

Mr. SPARKS. S-p-a-r-k-s.

Mr. MOSIER. Where do you live, Mr. Sparks?

Mr. SPARKS. Akron, Ohio.

Mr. MOSIER. How long have you lived in Akron?

Mr. SPARKS. About 25 years.

Mr. MOSIER. Have you held any public office in Akron?

Mr. SPARKS. I have been safety director of the city; I served two terms as postmaster, under two Presidents; I have been mayor of the city; I have been chairman of the Federal Housing Bureau of this present administration.

Mr. MOSIER. And you were elected mayor as a Republican, were you not?

Mr. SPARKS. No, sir; as a nonpartisan.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, Mr. Sparks, this committee has gone somewhat extensively into the sit-down strikes in the State of Michigan as affecting the automobile industry, and we have taken at least a glance at the strikes in the steel industry, and we are interested in going into the strikes and the un-American activities affecting the rubber industry. Akron, I understand, is the center of the rubber industry of the world, is it not?

Mr. SPARKS. Up until 1936 the city of Akron manufactured approximately 67 percent of all the rubber products of the world.

Mr. MOSIER. And you have been in Akron for 25 years?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You have held the various public offices that you have referred to?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Have you held any other positions that might be called civic, that were not subject to popular election?

Mr. SPARKS. I was chairman of the Summit County Veterans' Association.

Mr. MOSIER. Summit County is the county in Ohio in which Akron is located?

Mr. SPARKS. In which Akron is located. It is an association of all the veteran organizations.

I was chairman of the Citizens' Public Works Committee, which is organized under the present administration to promote public works for the city. I was chairman of the Law and Order League during the Goodyear strikes in 1936; in fact, during some or all of the strikes in 1936.

Mr. MOSIER. So you have held a number of public offices and have been the head of a number of civic groups in your city?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. When you went to Akron 25 years ago, how large was the city of Akron, in population?

Mr. SPARKS. Between sixty and seventy thousand.

Mr. MOSIER. And what is its main business industry?

Mr. SPARKS. Rubber.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you name the large companies that have their main offices and factories in Akron?

Mr. SPARKS. The large companies are the B. F. Goodrich Tire & Rubber Co., the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., and the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Mr. MOSIER. Those are the four leaders of the industry?

Mr. SPARKS. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. And from a population of sixty to seventy thousand 25 years ago, what was the population of Akron when you were mayor?

Mr. SPARKS. Approximately 275,000. The city grew 360 percent in 20 years in population.

Mr. MOSIER. And you were mayor in what years?

Mr. SPARKS. 1932 and 1933.

Mr. MOSIER. When you were mayor, and were elected on a non-partisan ticket, you never had any quarrel with labor, did you?

Mr. SPARKS. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. I want to bring out here, Mayor, that you are under subpoena by this committee, are you not?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And that you are not here testifying as prolabor or antilabor; that is true, is it?

Mr. SPARKS. That is absolutely true. Any thinking man knows that we must have unions and collective bargaining in our present economic situation.

Mr. MOSIER. And you have pursued that course in your public life?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir. I have been an employer of union labor.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, when did you first observe, in your official capacity, or in your capacity as the head of any of the civic groups in Akron, what we might call un-American activities in your city?

Mr. SPARKS. They first started in our city in 1932, when the worst of the depression was on the city.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you tell this committee what was the start of it, from your observation?

Mr. SPARKS. Our first communistic disturbances arose over the eviction of unfortunate people that were thrown out of their homes through legal procedure.

Mr. MOSIER. Were you mayor then?

Mr. SPARKS. I was mayor at that time. It became quite customary that every time a person was evicted from his home the Communist

Party would collect mobs around these houses and disturbances and rioting many time came about from those gatherings.

Mr. MOSIER. And that came to your notice, did it, in your official capacity?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir; very much so.

Mr. MOSIER. And as head of the police department of the city of Akron?

Mr. SPARKS. I was mayor at that time.

Mr. MOSIER. Well, you had under you the safety director, did you not?

Mr. SPARKS. Oh, yes; and had absolute control of the police force.

Mr. MOSIER. And who was the nominal head of the police department?

Mr. SPARKS. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, tell this committee, if you can, whether or not at that time there was an organized Communist group in Akron.

Mr. SPARKS. There was an organized group there, and very active—so active that during one of these disturbances one of my policemen was compelled to defend his life, had to shoot a Communist, and the poor fellow died.

Mr. MOSIER. That was at one of these disturbances arising from evictions by law?

Mr. SPARKS. One of these little civil commotion disturbances; yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, without going into the merits of that case, Mayor, it is a fact, you say, that one of the city policemen did kill a Communist?

Mr. SPARKS. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. Then what happened?

Mr. SPARKS. Then they gathered into a mob and stormed City Hall. They held a public funeral for the poor fellow. Approximately 3,000 Communists marched in a parade. They were reenforced from Communists from all over eastern Ohio, and they stormed City Hall one day with a rope, with big red flags and big placards, wanting to hang the mayor, although I happened to be in Canada at the time that the poor fellow was killed.

Following that there were some Communists arrested for rioting and thrown into jail, and the Communists were very active in forming groups to storm the judge's office, and public officials, and one night they gathered together about a thousand and marched on the judge's house, and they announced the intention that they were coming over to my home. Well, I went over to the judge's house and met them over there and influenced them to disperse and go back to town.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, Mayor, in your official capacity, did you learn to know these various people whom you call Communists?

Mr. SPARKS. They met with me many times, and I met with their committee many times. They would come and demand a hearing as the Communist Party with their leaders.

Mr. MOSIER. They said they were Communists?

Mr. SPARKS. Oh, yes.

Mr. MOSIER. In these conferences where you say they would gather from time to time, would the Communists that you knew were Communists personally lead the group?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And did they display any flags?

Mr. SPARKS. Not particularly in the mob gatherings. They do in their parades.

Mr. MOSIER. What flag would they display in their parades?

Mr. SPARKS. The "red" flag.

Mr. MOSIER. Who is the head of the Communist Party in the city of Akron?

Mr. SPARKS. Now a man by the name of Keller. When I was mayor there was a man by the name of Joe West, an alien.

Mr. MOSIER. You say he was an alien?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Never naturalized?

Mr. SPARKS. So he advised me.

Mr. MOSIER. He told you that?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Keller is the man who is now assigned to that area, to head the Communist group?

Mr. SPARKS. I think his title is secretary.

Mr. MOSIER. I think the record already has testimony in it concerning Keller, which was put into the record by another witness. Do you know what his first name is?

Mr. SPARKS. James Keller. He speaks for the Communist Party weekly on the radio.

Mr. MOSIER. He does at the present time?

Mr. SPARKS. He has for several years.

Mr. MOSIER. He speaks on the radio?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes; they have a regular program.

Mr. MOSIER. You observed the activities of the Communist group when you were mayor; let me ask you if you had any serious strikes while you were mayor of the city of Akron.

Mr. SPARKS. One.

Mr. MOSIER. One strike?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Was that at one of the rubber plants?

Mr. SPARKS. No; that was at the Enterprise Manufacturing Co.

Mr. MOSIER. That was the one serious strike that occurred; you were mayor 2 years?

Mr. SPARKS. That is right, a very short duration.

Mr. MOSIER. While you were mayor. I understand you told me you did not seek reelection.

Mr. SPARKS. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. So you were never defeated. You are better off in that respect than some of the rest of us.

Now, is it true or not that while you were mayor you became interested in subversive activities in the city of Akron?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir. I was elected mayor on a program of keeping industry in Akron, and naturally I was interested in anything that would occur.

Mr. MOSIER. And I understand further, that, starting from that interest, since you have left the office of mayor, you have broadened your studies to include the rest of the United States?

Mr. SPARKS. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. And for purposes of the record, I understand you are now writing a book on the question.

Mr. SPARKS. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. After you left the office of mayor, will you tell the committee the sequence of events that led into the strikes that they had in the rubber industry in Akron?

Mr. SPARKS. I do not quite understand your question.

Mr. MOSIER. What I want to get at is this: After you left the office of mayor, I want you, for the purposes of the record, to tell the committee what happened regarding the rubber situation in Akron, insofar as the Communists were concerned, and to what extent they were involved in the strikes which took place.

Mr. SPARKS. The Goodyear strike was pulled on February 13, 1936.

Mr. MOSIER. How many people did the Goodyear Co. employ at that time, in Akron?

Mr. SPARKS. They employed approximately 15,000 men.

Mr. MOSIER. And for purposes of the record, how many do these other plants employ, or did they employ, at that time, in 1936?

Mr. SPARKS. The general average of workers employed up to 1936 in Akron varied from 50,000 to 75,000. They had their off seasons, as you know.

Mr. MOSIER. Yes. Do you know what wages were paid in the industry?

Mr. SPARKS. The highest wage scale for skilled and semi-skilled workers in the United States.

Mr. MOSIER. What is the wage scale?

Mr. SPARKS. \$1.11 an hour for men and \$1 an hour for women.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you tell the committee a little about the strike of 1936? We do not want all the details, but just so we can get a birds-eye picture of it, with particular reference to the activities of Communists in that strike.

Mr. SPARKS. Approximately 200 men started the strike. The bulk of the workers were not in favor of the strike and had nothing to do with it.

In order to picket the plant, S O S calls were sent out all over northeastern Ohio for reinforcements, and they flocked in from all sections of the country, even down to the mining districts of Pennsylvania and West Virginia. More than 3,000 pickets gathered around the plants.

They set up an organization in a shack in the middle of the main street, and took over that whole section of the whole city. In other words, they had it under their own martial law; the police were not able to stay there and they stayed out.

Mr. MOSIER. Were there any Communists in that situation?

Mr. SPARKS. The Communists had not appeared in the beginning of the strike, but later on Communist leaders went on the radio.

Mr. MOSIER. Who were they?

Mr. SPARKS. Various men they would select—Mr. Keller and various speakers the Communist Party would select. I began to get letters after the strike had proceeded for several weeks, and they organized a law and order league, and as chairman of the law and order league I began to get letters from workers themselves. I have some of those letters here—and you are at liberty to look at them—calling my atten-

tion to the fact that both union and nonunion men were not responsible for the acts of violence for 4 or 5 weeks; that it was brought about through communistic agitators within the unions.

Mr. MOSIER. Did the Communists send any outside Communists in there?

Mr. SPARKS. That was our information. They sent in some speakers at that time. I have a digest of a communistic meeting held in one of our high schools on March 26, five days after the Goodyear strike was settled. Outside speakers spoke, and one of the well-known leaders in the city made a speech. I would like to read some excerpts.

Mr. MOSIER. Who took that down?

Mr. SPARKS. I had somebody in the meeting.

Mr. MOSIER. You had someone there?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Someone you could rely on?

Mr. SPARKS. That is right; and, following that, later on, one of the ministers of the city used parts of it on the radio.

Mr. MOSIER. Was it a public meeting?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes; more or less. There was no difficulty in getting into it at all.

Mr. MOSIER. Just give us the high lights of that speech.

Mr. SPARKS. This is a digest of a speech made by John Williamson. He said the eyes of all the world are on Akron over the writing of the chapter of glorious victory in the history of strike struggle as a starting of the promotion in mass production control by trade unions in the near future.

Mr. MOSIER. John Williamson is the secretary of the Communist Party in Ohio?

Mr. SPARKS. No; he is a known Communist leader in Akron, and my information is that he has his activities in a larger field.

Mr. MOSIER. But he is secretary of the Communist Party in Ohio, with headquarters in Cleveland?

Mr. SPARKS. He is.

Mr. MOSIER. He has Ohio under his jurisdiction?

Mr. SPARKS. That is right.

He admitted that not all that had been asked before has been won as yet, but that this was a war between management and worker, and that they felt they could gain more in the future by returning to work, as by doing so the picket lines had simply been transferred from the outside to the inside of the factory, and that if they held their lines as firmly in the future as they did in the last 5 weeks they would wring from the company every demand that they had ever made.

He also made the statement that unionism is communism, and agreed that Sparks was right when he said that the leaders were Communists, but he said that strikes come through good leadership.

I had made a charge over the radio that Communists were the agitators back of the strike.

Mr. MOSIER. He agreed with that in his speech and took credit for it in his speech?

Mr. SPARKS. That is right; put it in with my own statements.

Mr. MOSIER. Was there a woman in that strike called Red Rose, or did she come in later?

Mr. SPARKS. When the first strike started three Communist outside organizers came into the city—Adolph Germes and Rosa Pesota.

Mr. MOSIER. Who is she?

Mr. SPARKS. She was formerly a coworker of Emma Goldman's.

Mr. MOSIER. She came there?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Who else?

Mr. SPARKS. Powers Hapgood, who was recently arrested in the State of Maine and sentenced to jail for violence and disturbance.

Mr. MOSIER. What did they do?

Mr. SPARKS. They came to the city and directed the strike and the strike activities, as representatives of the C. I. O.

Mr. MOSIER. Did this Red Rose, so-called, make any speeches?

Mr. SPARKS. No; they do not make speeches.

Mr. MOSIER. She did not make any speeches?

Mr. SPARKS. They do not, except in meetings; meetings of the workers.

Mr. MOSIER. You say you received letters from many workers in the rubber plants and rubber factories saying that these strikes were Communist led?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You have, I understand, quite a file with you, but you have asked the committee not to disclose the names of the writers of those letters, although you will submit the letters to the committee for its examination; that is true, is it not?

Mr. SPARKS. That is true.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, Mr. Sparks, how was it possible for these radical leaders to get the control of the Akron rubber workers?

Mr. SPARKS. Mr. Mosier, I saw that city go from 60,000 to almost 300,000 population, one of the most happy, contented, prosperous communities in the United States. I suppose I have shaken hands with two-thirds of the rubber workers in that city. I know thousands of them intimately; I know their families and their children.

I know there was no higher grade of men in any industry in the whole United States. Knowing them as well as I do, I know that the conditions that arose in Akron, which have decentralized 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent of that industry, could not have come to pass if outside, radical organizers had not gone in there and sold this bunch of workers with a bill of goods, and that bill of goods was this: They came in there and made speeches at these meetings and sold them on the idea that they were going to build a great empire; "that we are going to crack wide open the rubber industry; we are going to move on to steel; and after we have organized rubber and steel, the two chief products of an automobile, we would move into Detroit, to the automobile section, and unionize 260,000 automobile workers."

Nobody has any objection to that, except over the methods which they used in their efforts to organize.

Mr. MOSIER. Did they tell these workers in Akron that they should

Mr. MOSIER. And the treatment that they were getting?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And the treatment that they were getting?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And that they should strike and cause trouble?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. That is the typical Communist maneuver, is it not, to spread that feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction?

Mr. SPARKS. That is not always confined to a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MOSIER. I know.

Mr. SPARKS. There are radicals within the unions that sell that idea.

Mr. MOSIER. That is the maneuver of the Communist Party.

Mr. SPARKS. That is right, and as evidence of that, following the Goodyear strike settlement on March 21, which was a mutually agreed contract, in the 275 days of that year the Goodyear Rubber Co. had 94 separate instances of violence and sit-downs within their plants, the very program outlined in this Communist speech of March 26.

I have the printed record of all those strike violences that occurred in 1936, after the union settlement was made, following the first strike in February, and you are welcome to them.

Mr. MOSIER. After the settlement had been made between the union and the company, still there were 94—

Mr. SPARKS. Ninety-four plant interruptions brought about by sit-downs and acts of violence.

The CHAIRMAN. What part did the Communists play in those 94 strikes and sit-downs, not the part played by outsiders and labor leaders, but what part did the Communists play? That is the point we are interested in, if you know, yourself.

Mr. SPARKS. I am not a member of a union and I do not work in a plant. That is a pretty hard question to answer, except this: As I say, weekly, and sometimes more often, the Communist Party would put their leaders on the radio and exhort the workers, keeping them in an agitated and disturbed condition, and easy to handle under those conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. In addition to the speeches, did you see or hear any Communists make any addresses or carry on any other activity in the plant?

Mr. SPARKS. I do not work in the plant.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you see any other evidence of Communist activity except speeches made by the Communists?

Mr. SPARKS. None at all.

Mr. MOSIER. I understand, Mayor, you are not in a position to personally observe what goes on in the plant.

Mr. SPARKS. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. The point you are trying to make before the committee is that here is a Communist meeting and a leading Communist makes a speech. You produce the speech before this committee, and that speech sets up about what is going to happen, what they want to happen, and what they allege they are able to do.

Mr. SPARKS. That speech said what was going to happen and what did happen.

Mr. MOSIER. Subsequent to that, although the labor trouble was ironed out between the company and the labor unions, still there were 94 strikes in 1 plant, after the contract was signed, during the balance of the year.

Mr. SPARKS. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. Which was exactly what the Communist leaders said would happen.

Mr. SPARKS. That is right.

Mr. MASON. In that meeting the statement was made that the picket line now would be moved inside rather than outside.

Mr. SPARKS. Definitely so.

Mr. MASON. As a result of that, the picket line being inside, these labor troubles and disturbances were developed.

Mr. SPARKS. There is the record of them.

Mr. MOSIER. We may have that record, may we, Mayor, to look over?

Mr. SPARKS. You can have it for the record.

Mr. MOSIER. After the Goodyear strike was settled in 1936, what other strikes, if any, took place?

Mr. SPARKS. Firestone had a strike which lasted 10 weeks.

Mr. MOSIER. How many workers were tied up in the Firestone strike?

Mr. SPARKS. Approximately 10,000.

Mr. MOSIER. 10,000?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And that lasted 10 weeks?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. When was that, in 1936 or 1937?

Mr. SPARKS. That was 1937.

Mr. MOSIER. That was last year.

Mr. SPARKS. Yes; that was last year. And at times, during the Goodyear strike, many of the organizers in their talks announced that they were going on to Firestone and on to Goodrich and on to General.

Mr. MOSIER. Did strikes actually occur in those plants?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir; we had 15 major strikes in 1936 and 1937, and in May or on Memorial Day night of 1938, there was a snap strike pulled at the Goodyear, when one policeman was shot and 60 men and women sent to the hospital, and the union officials following that strike—it did not last very long; there was a public uprising, and the union officials, following that strike, went on the air in a half-hearted way and apologized for it, and said it was the radical elements within their forces that had caused that strike.

Mr. MOSIER. The union officials said that?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes.

Mr. MOSIER. All that time the Communist Party broadcast each week to the rubber workers?

Mr. SPARKS. And the city.

Mr. MOSIER. To the city, and broadcast thereafter each week?

Mr. SPARKS. I would not say that; it was about each week; sometimes they would have one each week, but it may have gone 10 days. It was at frequent intervals.

Mr. MOSIER. You listened to those broadcasts?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes; I listen to all of them when I am in town.

Mr. MOSIER. And the general purport of the broadcast was by teaching their people to agitate, to cause trouble here and trouble there.

Mr. SPARKS. If they did not they would not have a Communist Party or any members.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, does the the influence of what you choose to call the radical element, which includes the Communists, I assume, and the Socialists, and the rest of them—does that influence extend outside of the city of Akron?

Mr. SPARKS. Very much so. During the steel strike in 1937, about 3,000 rubber workers armed themselves with guns, rifles, shotguns, and revolvers, and led a caravan into Youngstown to assist the steel strikers. They were disarmed in Youngstown and those arms almost filled a room. Pictures were taken and published in all the newspapers of the State.

Mr. MOSIER. That is, they were disarmed by the police officers?

Mr. SPARKS. Disarmed by the militia.

Mr. MOSIER. We have had some testimony on that question.

Mr. SPARKS. Following the settlement of the steel strike, Mr. Owens, State director of the C. I. O., issued, through the newspapers, a statement thanking the rubber workers for their armed assistance to the strikers in Youngstown, and said that some day they would return the favor.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you have any personal knowledge of Gus Hallberg, who is known as Gus Hall, a Communist, who led the steel strike in Youngstown? Have you ever had any trouble with him?

Mr. SPARKS. In some of my research I have run across matter telling all about him and his connections, and in newspaper publicity.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, you want to make it clear, do you, Mayor, that these strikes which occurred in Akron were not agitated by the rubber workers themselves?

Mr. SPARKS. Oh, yes; there were some radicals among the rubber workers, dissatisfied. You will find that in all industry. But when you consider that it was those thousands and thousands of rubber workers who had built up the city to what it was—they built the city, and it was skilled activities in the industries that brought them that high wage, nobody can tell me that those men, as I know them, would tear down deliberately what they had supposed to be their future security, and today there are thousands of people who are on Government relief in the city.

Mr. MOSIER. You testified that Akron was a city, when you were mayor, of 275,000 population, I believe?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And that there were in the city four large rubber plants that manufactured what percentage of rubber products?

Mr. SPARKS. Sixty-seven percent of all rubber products of the world.

Mr. MOSIER. What is the situation in Akron today?

Mr. SPARKS. Akron is coming back. The civic spirit lay dormant for 2 years and it has been reawakened. Our industry, 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent of it, has gone to eight States.

Mr. MOSIER. And the rubber companies have been——

Mr. SPARKS. Decentralized.

Mr. MOSIER. Decentralized?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You say that just a third of the output is now manufactured in Akron that was manufactured before?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. How many people do they employ in the rubber companies?

Mr. SPARKS. Less than 25,000.

Mr. MOSIER. Less than 25,000?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Is that full-time employment?

Mr. SPARKS. No; they have been having short hours, portions of them.

Mr. MOSIER. The wage average is about the same as it was?

Mr. SPARKS. \$1.11 an hour is the maximum wage for men, for unskilled labor; and for women, \$1 an hour.

Mr. MOSIER. It is \$1.11 for men and \$1 for women?

Mr. SPARKS. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. That is the prevailing wage today?

Mr. SPARKS. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. Has the population of Akron decreased?

Mr. SPARKS. Some; but there are thousands of Akron wage earners there that have no jobs and no prospect of jobs who are now, of course, on W. P. A.

Mr. MOSIER. What is your relief situation there?

Mr. SPARKS. Very bad; approximately 60 percent of the population of Akron rely on Government checks and relief.

Mr. MOSIER. And State relief.

Mr. SPARKS. That is not only Akron; it is about the same percentage in the State of Ohio. There are 38,000 more people on Government relief in Ohio than in any other State in the United States, through that industrial section.

Mr. MOSIER. That centers in the industrial section--the Cleveland-Pittsburgh area?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes; and Detroit.

The CHAIRMAN. We will suspend the hearing at this time until 1:30 o'clock this afternoon.

(Thereupon, the committee took a recess until 1:30 p. m. this day.)

AFTER RECESS

The subcommittee reconvened at 1:30 p. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

TESTIMONY OF CHARLES NELSON SPARKS—Resumed

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. Sparks, resuming your testimony where we left off at noon. I would like to ask you a little more concerning the present situation existing in the city of Akron. What about property values in the city of Akron today as compared or contrasted with those that existed when you were mayor?

Mr. SPARKS. Off about 50 percent, with some improvement within the last 60 days.

Mr. MOSIER. Does that apply pretty generally throughout the city?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. To all types of property, large and small, business, manufacturing, and residential property?

Mr. SPARKS. Everything. You see, we have had an unprecedented number of foreclosures. Formerly, 80 percent of the tire workers were home owners. It has dropped to about 35 percent.

Mr. MOSIER. I am asking these questions, Mr. Sparks, appreciating the fact that you do not know a lot of the details about communistic

activities in Akron. We will have witnesses later from Akron who are more conversant with the operations of the individual Communists there. I want to get the broad picture from you because I believe you have made a study not only of conditions in Akron, but in other sections of the country.

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir; all over the country.

Mr. MOSIER. The sum total of the Akron situation is that the tire companies have moved about two-thirds of their production out of the city of Akron and out of the State of Ohio?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes.

Mr. MOSIER. As a result of these labor disputes which occurred within the last few years, whatever the reason may have been for the labor disputes?

Mr. SPARKS. Not wholly as a result.

Mr. MOSIER. Not wholly as a result?

Mr. SPARKS. Not wholly as a result; no.

Mr. MOSIER. In order to be fair about it, what are the other reasons for that situation?

Mr. SPARKS. We will all agree that decentralization of our mammoth industries is very helpful to this country. There should be a wider distribution of manufacturing in the United States. But it should come about in the orderly, planned processes, and not within a short period, forced at great expense to the community and to the stockholders and to the workers themselves.

There are many economic reasons why there should be decentralization. One of the chief reasons is our national defense. But the labor disturbances brought that about because the customers for the rubber industry, or any other industry, want to know whether they are going to get their product or not.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, have you, in this labor situation that you are discussing, made any study of the strike situation generally throughout the United States?

Mr. SPARKS. I have made a study of practically the whole United States covering strikes within the last 4 years. I have visited many of the cities and made my own researches preparatory for my book and a lecture tour that I have started out on.

Mr. MOSIER. Your visits were in connection with the matter of gathering material for your book?

Mr. SPARKS. That is correct.

Mr. MOSIER. And you say a lecture tour?

Mr. SPARKS. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. Can you tell this committee whether or not you have found that in other sections of the country where there have been labor disturbances the Communists have contributed to those disturbances?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you make that as a statement, as a generality throughout the United States?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. That the Communists have contributed?

Mr. SPARKS. They are always in the picture wherever there has been a strike disturbance. They are not always in the picture in the smaller communities where there are justifiable strikes. Out of the unprecedented number of strikes in the United States, many of them

were perfectly justified. The fact of the matter is I am not going to argue whether all of them are justified. But the conditions resulting from those strikes were not justified, with respect to law and order, of course.

Mr. MOSIER. Have you made any investigation as to the actual number of strikes that occurred in the United States in the last 4 years?

Mr. SPARKS. I have made researches over 8 years. The figures are not yet available for 1938.

I have taken a period from 1929 to 1932. There were 3,209 strikes in those 4 years involving 1,135,000 men, with a loss in wages and production of 26,062,000 man-days.

Mr. MOSIER. That is in those 3 years?

Mr. SPARKS. Four years.

Mr. MOSIER. In 4 years, 1929 to 1932, inclusive?

Mr. SPARKS. That is right. From 1933 to 1937 there have been 12,477 strikes, involving 6,399,000 men, and 94,244,857 man-days lost in wages and production. I have reduced that down to actual dollars.

Mr. MOSIER. Can you break that down into money value?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What would that be?

Mr. SPARKS. Predicated on the Department of Labor's own figures of an average of 57 cents an hour per wage earner in the United States in all industries—it is not quite a fair estimate for the reason that many of these strikes were pulled in areas where the wages ran from as high as \$1.11 in ours, to the automobile industry of 90 cents an hour—but taking as a basis the Department of Labor's own figures of 56.4 cents instead of 57 cents, that means that industry and commerce and labor have contributed to these 4 years' strikes \$4,200,000,000.

Mr. MOSIER. As compared with what in the previous 4 years?

Mr. SPARKS. As compared with 26,000,000 man-days, which would be about \$260,000,000.

Mr. MOSIER. In the previous 4 years?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes.

Mr. MOSIER. Have you made any investigation on the west coast?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What did you find out there with respect to the general situation?

Mr. SPARKS. I found the same situation existing through Seattle, Portland, Tacoma, as exists in San Francisco.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you find that communistic activities on the west coast contribute materially to the situation?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir; that is very much of public knowledge on the west coast.

Mr. MOSIER. It is very much in evidence?

Mr. SPARKS. Freely discussed by everybody. The city of San Francisco has lost half of its industries to Los Angeles. Shipping arrivals have fallen off from 13,000, normal average arrival per year, down to nine. And very few of those ships come in with the American flag on it.

Mr. MOSIER. That is the industry that Harry Bridges has something to do with?

Mr. SPARKS. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. He has been frequently the subject of discussion before this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. What could you add, as a matter of fact, giving us as many facts as possible, with regard to the part that the Communists played in these various strikes; for instance, in Akron, the 94 strikes there that you testified about?

Mr. SPARKS. Ninety-four? I said there had been 15 major strikes in the rubber industries alone in Akron.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the total number of strikes in Akron, according to your testimony?

Mr. SPARKS. That would be very hard to say.

Mr. MOSIER. You testified this morning that after the Goodyear strike was settled there were some 60—

Mr. SPARKS. There were 94 interruptions in that plant, from strikes, sit-downs, and acts of violence, in a year.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the figure I had in mind. Were you present in Akron during that time?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Were most of those sit-down strikes? That is, most of those 94 were sit-down strikes?

Mr. SPARKS. The majority were.

The CHAIRMAN. The majority were?

Mr. SPARKS. Of course a lot of acts of violence resulted from the sit-down strikes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of your own knowledge that Communists took a leading part in these strikes?

Mr. SPARKS. Except from their own speeches on the radio, in which they defended the sit-downers and defended the strikers and fought the battles for the organization that was striking; their public activities. As to their private activities, what went on back in their own offices, in connection with the other unions, I could not tell that, of course, except from hearsay and reports brought in from the workers themselves, which, as I told you, I have letters here that you can look at, that the Communists were active in the unions' activities.

Mr. MOSIER. Did the C. I. O. ever disavow any connection with the Communist Party?

Mr. SPARKS. They never have to my knowledge.

Mr. MOSIER. The Communists have claimed, on the radio and otherwise, that they were—

Mr. SPARKS. Fully responsible for the trouble.

Mr. MOSIER. Responsible for these strikes?

Mr. SPARKS. That is right, and openly participated in them.

The CHAIRMAN. You were testifying about the number of man-hours lost on account of strikes and the amount of money that was involved. What about the other side of the picture? What did labor gain through these strikes? Have you made any investigation of that?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes; labor in Akron has gained some concessions in seniority rights; some concessions in the number of tires per man per day that they would make. Formerly the rubber maker made 65 to 70 tires a day; that is, a good experienced rubber worker. Now the union ticket is 56 tires a day.

The CHAIRMAN. So they gained some concessions from the strikes?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes. You see, the unusual thing about this unionization of the rubber industry in Akron, that cannot be understood—I do not understand it, I have not figured it out, except that we made the

greatest production for automobiles of any other section of the rubber industry. But the rubber manufacturing institutions in New Jersey and Pennsylvania and Massachusetts and New York—those are the principal States in which there are other rubber manufacturing plants—their wage scale was some 30 percent lower than the Akron area, and they worked 15 percent longer hours. So it is pretty hard to understand why they would come into a city that had a high wage scale and shorter hours and were contented and happy.

Mr. MASON. I would like to ask you if this reduction in the output per man of the number of tires per day was a reduction because of shorter hours or because of slowing up in the speed required of the workman.

Mr. SPARKS. Slowing up.

Mr. MASON. Slowing up the speed; the hours are the same?

Mr. SPARKS. The hours are the same. It is a slowing up of the speed. The point at issue there, on the part of the unions, I presume—we all presume—was to increase the number of employees.

The CHAIRMAN. You gave only the gains to labor in Akron, in the rubber industry. What about the whole picture?

Mr. SPARKS. Generally over the State they have increased.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean all over the country.

Mr. SPARKS. Over the country they have increased their wage scales.

The CHAIRMAN. In fairness, then, would you not have to deduct from the amount of money lost what they have gained in these respects? In other words, you would have to take into consideration the gains to labor?

Mr. SPARKS. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. So that it is not always a one-sided proposition?

Mr. SPARKS. There have been some gains to labor, quite a lot in some sections, in wages and in hours.

The CHAIRMAN. You have computed, have you not, the amount of money gains to labor?

Mr. SPARKS. I am computing that now.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not completed it.

Mr. SPARKS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not contend, of course, that the Communists were responsible for all of those strikes.

Mr. SPARKS. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Or for a majority of them.

Mr. SPARKS. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not contending that any considerable percentage of laboring people are in sympathy with communism.

Mr. SPARKS. I would say that a vast majority of laborers are against it.

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. Chairman, I have been handed a copy of a magazine called Fight, purporting to be published by the League Against War and Fascism. This is the issue of March 1937, and in it I find an article signed by Henry Zon, entitled "The Spy," appearing on page 5.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it show that the chairman of the publication was Harry F. Ward; vice chairman, Robert Morss Lovett, Mrs. Victor L. Berger, Earl Browder, Max S. Hayes, and Jacob Mirsky, with William P. Mangold as treasurer?

Mr. MOSIER. The chairman is Harry F. Ward, and I think all of those names appear here. It is published monthly by the national executive committee of the American League Against War and Fascism.

Mr. MASON. Which is now the American League for Peace and Democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The reason I asked that is because there was a good deal of testimony about a man by the name of Mangold by whom those volunteers who went to Spain were recruited. I therefore thought it might be material in showing the names of well-known Communists who are officers in the League Against War and Fascism, or in the League for Peace and Democracy now. We had some testimony in connection with a man named Mangold.

Mr. MOSIER. The names here are Harry F. Ward, chairman; Robert Morss Lovett, Mrs. Victor L. Berger, Earl Browder, Max S. Hayes, and Jacob Mirsky, the vice chairmen; William P. Mangold, treasurer, with the following secretarial staff:

Executive, Paul Reed; administration, Clara Bodian; education, Robert K. Speer; publications and publicity, Frank B. Blumenfeld; youth, James Lerner; woman, Dorothy McConnell; trade union, John Masso; religious, Herman F. Reissig.

My object in making this statement, Mr. Chairman, is this: In connection with Mr. Sparks' testimony, it starts at Akron, Ohio, and leads into the steel strike in the Cleveland-Pittsburgh area. We have had testimony from other witnesses to the effect that well-known Communists at Youngstown, by the names of Gus Hall, or Halberg, and Steuben, were in charge of the steel strike. I happen to know of my own knowledge, from reading the record of the LaFollette Committee hearings that these men, or, at least, Steuben, were called as witnesses before that committee. Now, this Communist, in this magazine, Fight, issue of March 1937, in discussing the creation of the LaFollette Committee, has this to say, or at least, Mr. Henry Zon, the purported author of the article, says:

This investigation (referring to the La Follette investigation) was born in the Cosmos Club in Washington one February evening in 1936. Present at the meeting were some 15 people, including John L. Lewis, Gardner Jackson, of the American Civil Liberties Union, Dorothy Detzer, of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Senator Robert La Follette, now chairman of the Subcommittee on Education and Labor, conducting the inquiry, and other liberals and socially minded people.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we subpoena Mr. Henry Zon, the author of this article to divulge to this committee the names of the other liberals and socially minded people who were present on that date.

This article is rather lengthy, but for the purposes of the record, I would like to read another paragraph, as follows:

From the discussion there was evolved the idea of a senatorial investigation of the violations of civil liberties. Senator La Follette agreed to go to bat for it, and the lobbyists represented agreed to throw the weight of their organizations toward securing necessary appropriations and authorizations.

Then, further—

As the Seventy-fourth Congress came to a close, the La Follette resolution lagged in the Senate Committee on Audit and Control. Under the spur of letters and lobbying the resolution came out, providing \$15,000 for the work of

investigating the disappearance of civil liberties in various sections of the United States.

In the months that followed the committee was organized, borrowing generously from the old munitions investigation staff, the National Labor Relations Board, and various Government agencies, including the Works Progress Administration.

Evidently they were not in a lending mood when we came along.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your idea of subpoenaing him?

Mr. MOSIER. I would like to subpoena Mr. Henry Zon and find out who else was present on that occasion when this matter was discussed, and when it was decided the investigation of civil liberties should be conducted.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any information as to who some of those people were that were present?

Mr. MOSIER. I have not enough testimony or information to testify as to them, but I have information enough to believe that if we found out who was present it would be pretty interesting reading.

Mr. MASON. Of course, I do not know what is in Mr. Mosier's mind as to who was there, but if some of those socially minded people were known Communists, then it seems to me that this committee should not hesitate to get their names and put them on record in any way we can possibly do it, because if a committee of the United States Congress was born among a group of people at a meeting at which outspoken and well-known Communists were present, I think the American people would be interested in finding out that fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The only jurisdiction we would have, or the only right we would have, to inquire into that would be upon the basis that Communists were present. This committee would not have any concern over the matter except insofar as that Communists participated in the meeting. We might discuss that phase of it in executive session and agree upon a program. In other words, this committee does not want to become involved in a dispute with another committee. I do not want to be placed in the attitude of having anything to do with another committee. The only reason we have for going into it is that we have an article here written by this man for the magazine *Fight*, and in it he has made a statement about the origin of another committee. This man is a reporter for some Communist publication.

Mr. MOSIER. Yes; it is published by the American League Against War and Fascism.

The CHAIRMAN. Our question is to find out if there were any Communists present. If not, we have no concern with the matter. If there were any Communists present, we are concerned about it, and it is our duty to find out what Communists were there.

Mr. SPARKS. Mr. Chairman, may I take 2 or 3 minutes of your time to bring up a question that might be of interest of this committee?

The CHAIRMAN. We will discuss it with you first.

Mr. MOSIER. I will ask the witness this: Mr. Sparks, have you made any investigation or any study of the violation of civil liberties?

Mr. SPARKS. I have been very much interested and vitally interested in the question of the civil liberties of all citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not answered Mr. Mosier's question: Have you made any investigation of that subject?

Mr. MOSIER. Have you gone into that subject?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Not only in relation to the civil liberties of members of labor unions, but the civil liberties of those who are not members of labor unions?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. How many people in the United States, presumably, have some civil liberties who are not members of labor unions?

Mr. SPARKS. Very few.

Mr. MOSIER. How many people are not members of labor unions?

Mr. SPARKS. Forty-four million out of the fifty-three million.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you mean adults or workers?

Mr. SPARKS. I mean workers or wage earners, who have no special legislation to protect their civil liberties or their economic future, and who have not asked for any.

Mr. MOSIER. That is the class you are speaking of.

Mr. SPARKS. I am speaking of both classes.

Mr. MOSIER. With particular reference to the 44,000,000?

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. I think that is the only question I have.

The CHAIRMAN. We have some witnesses subpoenaed who will be here tomorrow morning. We will resume at 10:30 tomorrow morning.

(Thereupon, the subcommittee adjourned to meet tomorrow, Wednesday, November 16, 1938, at 10:30 a. m.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1938

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES.

Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

Present also: Mr. Mosier and Mr. Mason.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

The committee considered the motion by Mr. Mosier that we investigate an article which appeared in the Fight magazine with reference to the origin of the La Follette committee.

After due consideration the committee questions the propriety of going into that matter at this time in view of the fact that this is another committee of the Congress of the United States, and it would involve questions of a committee of the House encroaching upon the jurisdiction of a committee of the Senate; and in view of that situation this committee is going to defer any action on that, at least for the time being, until further consideration is given to it by the entire committee; there being a serious question as to the right of one committee to make any investigation with reference to another committee. And, regardless of any questions raised as to the character of witnesses before a committee, or as to the origin of the committee, or anything of that sort, there is, above all those questions, the question of the independence of a committee of one branch of the Government, which another branch has no right to encroach upon.

That raises a very serious question, and this committee feels that nothing should be done by this committee until the matter is given a very thorough and complete investigation; that is, until the full committee is consulted. And so, for the time being, there will be nothing done with reference to that.

We have given consideration and thought to the advisability of inviting a number of prominent Americans to appear before the committee during the remainder of our time, beginning, say, December 1, for the purpose of giving us affirmative testimony. We have had a great deal of testimony against various things. The thought has occurred to the Chair that if a number of representative citizens were invited to appear before the committee to testify with regard to what can be done to promote Americanism in this country, that would be of considerable benefit to the committee in writing the report, and also to the country.

The Chair will therefore invite the head of the American Federation of Labor, the head of the American Legion, the head of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the head of the National Grange, the head of the Knights of Columbus, the head of the Masons, and outstanding clergymen of all denominations; the head of the Daughters of the American Revolution, the head of the Sons of the American Revolution, the head of the B'nai B'rith, the head of the German societies, the head of the Sons of Italy, the head of the Knights of Pythias, the head of the Odd Fellows, and outstanding educational representatives and representatives of racial groups, to appear before this committee during the month of December to testify from an affirmative point of view; that is, to tell us what can be done and what should be done to promote and revitalize Americanism in this country; and by pursuing that course we will have in the record not only testimony exposing subversive activities, but we will also have some affirmative testimony as to what can be done in the future to instill greater love for Americanism and to promote it throughout the country.

Mr. Pace, will you be sworn?

TESTIMONY OF JOHN T. PACE

The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your full name?

Mr. PACE. John T. Pace.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you live, Mr. Pace?

Mr. PACE. Detroit.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you lived in Detroit?

Mr. PACE. Since 1920.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you live before you came to Detroit?

Mr. PACE. Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a native of Tennessee?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What part of Tennessee?

Mr. PACE. Hickman County; Centerville, about 75 miles southwest of Nashville.

The CHAIRMAN. What business have you been engaged in since you came to Detroit, generally speaking?

Mr. PACE. My first work was factory work. Then from 1924 until 1928 I worked for the city of Lincoln Park. That is termed "Detroit," because it is a suburb of Detroit. After 1928 I was engaged in the general contracting business; that is, during 1928, 1929, and 1930.

The CHAIRMAN. How old a man are you?

Mr. PACE. Forty-one.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a family?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. A wife and children?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you become a member?

Mr. PACE. In 1931.

The CHAIRMAN. How long did you remain a member?

Mr. PACE. Until 1934.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you tell us how you happened to become a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PACE. Well, as I stated before, I was in the contracting business. When the crash came in 1929, I lost it, and what money I had in a bank that was closed, and I lost that, and the money that I had gone into business with was, I figured, pretty hard to earn. Well, I just got sore, that is all. I got sore at myself and everybody else.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you do to become a member of the Communist Party? Were you first contacted by someone?

Mr. PACE. During this period of dissatisfaction I got connected with an unemployed group.

The CHAIRMAN. What group was that?

Mr. PACE. The Unemployed Council. It is an unemployed organization, organized by the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you get connected with it?

Mr. PACE. I don't know exactly how I got connected with it; I guess just through being dissatisfied and meeting with other dissatisfied people, and finally got invited into this organization; and, of course, having experience in public life and being before the public, I became officially active in the unemployed organization; and after a period in that, I joined the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you do to join the Communist Party?

Mr. PACE. Well, I was just approached by one of the members.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you remember who approached you?

Mr. PACE. William Reynolds. He was at that time quite active.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you sign an application blank to become a member?

Mr. PACE. A card.

The CHAIRMAN. You signed a card to become a member?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How long after that was it before they admitted you?

Mr. PACE. I would say immediately; within a week or 10 days.

The CHAIRMAN. Within a week or 10 days they admitted you?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What branch? Did you join the section of the Communist Party at Detroit?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir; a unit of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. What unit did you join?

Mr. PACE. It was called the Lincoln Park unit at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. How many members did it have at that time?

Mr. PACE. About 12 or 15 members.

The CHAIRMAN. What were the functions of this unit, and what devolved upon you when you joined it?

Mr. PACE. Well, a unit of the Communist Party is—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I do not mean that. I mean, what was your duty?

Mr. PACE. To carry on unemployed work; to be active in organizing the unemployed.

This unit was what was termed "a street unit." You see, they have two types of units, shop nuclei and street units.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you attend many meetings of the unit?

Mr. PACE. I attended them all. I became unit organizer shortly after joining.

The CHAIRMAN. Did your unit have separate meetings from the rest of the Communist units?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have a chairman or president of the unit?

Mr. PACE. A unit organizer.

The CHAIRMAN. Organizer of the unit?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you hold that position?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did your unit then meet with other units of the Communist Party in general meetings?

Mr. PACE. Pardon me; can I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; go right ahead.

Mr. PACE. In this, I would rather tell the functions of these units in giving the complete structure of the party. I think I can do it better.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; suppose you do that in your own language. We want to get first something about the structure of the party, what these units mean, and so forth.

Mr. PACE. Do you want me to say a few words on the history of the party?

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you some more preliminary questions.

Mr. PACE. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. As a member of this unit, did you carry on your organizing work with the unemployed?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us to what extent you carried that on.

Mr. PACE. You see, we had this unit, as I said before, a street unit, and we had an Unemployed Council in the city. Well, this unit meets and forms a policy to be carried on within this Unemployed Council. If there is a demonstration to be planned, all the details are thrashed out in this unit, and the members of this unit, as members of the Unemployed Council, go into the Unemployed Council and foster this program.

The CHAIRMAN. How do they foster it?

Mr. PACE. I mean they put the program into effect by general discussion as members of the Unemployed Council not as party members. You see, the party members are more or less concealed—their party identity—in the Unemployed Council, the same as I will touch on in mass organization and mass work.

The CHAIRMAN. So that when you go into the Council you have had a preliminary meeting of your unit to determine a program?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the members of your unit are also members of the Council?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So, when you have agreed upon a program, you come in, not as members of the Communist Party but as members of the Council, but you act in unison and in harmony in carrying out your program?

Mr. PACE. That is a fact.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the fact that you are organized and have a unified program, and know what you are going to do in a meeting, enable you to put over your program?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How does it enable you to put over your program? Say there are two or three members of your unit in the Unemployed Council, how do you put over your program?

Mr. PACE. We will say 150 members.

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred and fifty members then.

Mr. PACE. In the first place, in this discussion in the unit, they first determine the impulse of the people—of the unemployed. They know what their grievances are, and on the basis of these grievances they are able to perfect a program that will be acceptable to this Unemployed Council.

The CHAIRMAN. Then do you select the Communist member who is going to make a motion and the ones who are going to second the motion? Is that all selected in advance?

Mr. PACE. No. The leader of the unit will get up and make a talk on proposals, because, after all, they see to it that certain members of the unit are in official positions in the Unemployed Council.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you get the members of the Communist unit in a strategic position in the Unemployed Council?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

Now, in addition to this there is what they call a unit bureau; that is, three members or, if the unit would be smaller, five members. It constitutes the political guidance of the unit. These leading political figures in that unit might come together an hour or 2 hours before the Unemployed Council meeting on something new that has developed since the last unit meeting. So if one of these gets up in the Unemployed Council meeting and makes proposals, the rest of the unit members know that they are obligated to stand by those proposals, because that is a proposal of the unit leadership.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, what effect does the fact that you are working in unison and in harmony, and the fact that you have Communist members in key positions in the organization have upon your ability to control the situation?

Mr. PACE. Well, it has a great effect. That is the controlling factor.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you find that to be a fact throughout your experience with the Unemployed Council?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That the Communist unit within the Unemployed Council could control the policies and the activities of the Unemployed Council?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How long did you remain in the Unemployed Council, doing this work for the Communists?

Mr. PACE. I imagine about a year.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you in the Unemployed Council when it merged—or did it merge at any time—with the Workers Alliance?

Mr. PACE. Not at that time; a few years after that.

The CHAIRMAN. You got out of it before it merged?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was head of the Unemployed Council; do you recall?

Mr. PACE. At that time—you mean when I first joined?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. PACE. In Detroit or nationally?

The CHAIRMAN. Nationally.

Mr. PACE. I. Amter; Israel Amter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he a well-known Communist?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir; a well-known and nationally known Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. He was a candidate for Congress on the Communist ticket in New York.

Mr. PACE. And there was also—I had this name in mind—Benjamin.

The CHAIRMAN. Herbert Benjamin?

Mr. PACE. Herbert Benjamin.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he a well-known Communist?

Mr. PACE. A well-known and nationally known Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. What position did he occupy; do you recall?

Mr. PACE. National organizer.

The CHAIRMAN. For the Unemployed Council?

Mr. PACE. For the Unemployed Council. I. Amter was the national secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, when the Unemployed Council merged with the Workers Alliance, did Mr. Benjamin retain his position?

Mr. PACE. That I do not know. That has happened since I severed all connections with the movement.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not in a position to tell us anything about the Workers Alliance?

Mr. PACE. No, sir. I know at the time the Workers Alliance was only a local organization around the States of Illinois and Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it a Communist organization at that time?

Mr. PACE. Not at that time; no, sir. The Communists gained control of that by the new policy formed in 1934.

The CHAIRMAN. Now I think you have given us enough about that particular Unemployed Council. While you were in the Unemployed Council did you have occasion to organize and lead any march?

Mr. PACE. Not except locally; just local demonstrations to welfare stations.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever lead a march on the city of Washington?

Mr. PACE. Not in the unemployed movement. That was after I was out of the unemployed movement.

The CHAIRMAN. Now tell us what happened—we will get this thing in the order in which it occurred—after you left the Unemployed Council; then what did your work consist of? Where did you go?

Mr. PACE. Party work.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you explain what you mean by party work?

Mr. PACE. Working as a direct party representative, assisting members that are assigned to union activities or unemployed activities or mass organizations, fraternal organizations, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you assign different members of the Communist Party to other organizations, to work in other organizations?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean by that that some members would be assigned to union activities, to labor work?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And other members would be assigned to fraternal work?

Mr. PACE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. How would you decide which members to assign to particular fields of activity—on what basis?

Mr. PACE. On the basis of their own standing. For instance, if they were unemployed, or had been for some time, they would naturally be assigned to unemployed work; members who were working in factories would be assigned to shop work; members who belonged to certain language groups would be assigned to that language organization, like the Slavs and the Hungarians and the Finnish, and the different fraternal organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. What were they instructed to do when they got into their particular organizations that they were assigned to?

Mr. PACE. To carry out the general instructions of the party.

The CHAIRMAN. Where does the party get its general instructions?

Mr. PACE. That is why I wanted to bring all this in, in my telling of the functions of the Communist Party—to cover all that.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. All right.

Mr. PACE. You want to start from the beginning of the party?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. PACE. Of how the Communist Party was formed?

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. PACE. In the first place, the Communist Party is a political party organized from that section of the people which they term is the most militant and the most susceptible to party rule, and the most willing to go out and fight against the government, based upon the theory of Karl Marx, who wrote *The Theory of the Evolution of Society*, and his theory that capitalism cannot be destroyed without the organized force of the working class. That is the theory.

After this theory came out, a fellow by the name of Karl Kautsky wrote books and literature on how to organize practically on the basis of Marx's theory, and it was organized in what they called the Second International, or the Socialist Party. The Socialist Party began to develop trends to the right; that is, more conservative trends. The left wing of the Socialist Party decided that it was going too far to the right in getting away from revolution. They began to develop the theory that the government could be taken over by the ballot. So the left-wing element, after the—well, during this time Lenin was organizing the Bolshevik Party in Russia, and he wrote *The Theory Put Into Practice*, which showed how to apply the theory of Karl Marx into a practical political party for the overthrow of the government.

In 1905 Lenin went before Czar Nicholas. This is important, because it is going to touch with some testimony that I wish to give in regard to Army activities in America. He led a demonstration something like the demonstrations to Washington here, and the Ford hun-

ger march. So Czar Nicholas says to Lenin—of course, this is written material; I did not hear this—

The CHAIRMAN. You got that out of—

Mr. PACE. Out of various books written by various writers in the revolutionary movement—revolutionary writers.

Czar Nicholas says to him, "How do you expect to take control of our government when we have all the means of education, we have all the physical means, we have the army and the navy, and so forth?"

Lenin says, "We will use your army and navy."

In the process of organization of the Bolshevik Party they did use the government's army and navy in the Russian revolution. So in 1917, when the Bolshevik Party—there was no Communist Party at that time, but it was organized on this same theory that the Communist Party is organized on now—when the government was overthrown in 1917, then they began to discuss the building of an international political party, or the setting up of the Third International. That was done in 1919, and that was when the Communist Party in the United States was formed—in 1919.

They held the first world congress in Moscow, and delegates from all the respective countries that had a revolutionary movement of any kind were sent to this international congress. The international organization was set up, and then each country set up its central committee.

They organized what they called the E. C. C. I. E. C. C. I. are the initials for Executive Committee of the Communist International. From this committee national and international policies are set down.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is that committee stationed?

Mr. PACE. In Moscow. The central committee in New York City at that time—well, the party at that time in the United States was the Socialist Party, the Second International, and when the left-wing element split away from the Second International and set up the Communist Party in America it was split. The Communist Party broke away with the minority. This is important, because it shows now, today, how a minority can build into a majority by the constant daily process of organization.

They started with a minority. When the committee went to Moscow, before the executive committee of the International, I believe that Foster and Earl Browder and Jay Lovestone—I don't know all the names, but those are some—then the Communist committee split on policy on the two major questions in the trade-union movement. The Lovestone group said that they could not build dual unions in the United States. The party organization itself said, "We will build union groups—our own revolutionary union Communist groups."

Then the other major question was the social question of the Negro race. The Communist Party said, "All religious lines must be broken down; we must have social equality of all races." The Lovestone faction said, "We must establish self-determination in the Black Belt." That was setting up a territory for the Negro people.

Those were the two major questions that caused this split.

Again, this same point came out when Lovestone says that Stalin—he says, "We will control the Communist Party in America; we have a majority." Stalin says, "You have today, but you will not tomorrow," which has proven itself to be true. The Lovestone group does not have control today. They do not even compare with the

others. So from that time on they started building themselves an organization, until they built it up to the present status.

Now, the structure of the party is in the executive committee of the Communist International in Moscow. From that committee you have a central committee in each respective country; they all have their central committees.

Then, this country is divided into districts, and each district has a committee called a district committee, like Michigan is district 7, of the Communist Party of the United States.

Michigan is divided into sections, like, for instance, in Flint, Saginaw, Bay City, Grand Rapids, Ann Arbor, and so forth, and the city of Detroit proper has its sections, divided not so much geographically as it is in the trade-union movement. So that they have what they call trade sections; that is, for instance, a section committee on the west side of Detroit. That was section 7 of district 7 of the city of Detroit.

That is, this section committee is divided into units, territorial units, which take in the area of a few blocks and shop units assigned to certain shops. For instance, Ford will have a foundry unit, an assembly unit, a machine-shop unit, a body-department unit, and so forth. They are designated by the particular department they represent. That is the structure of the party.

The Communist International will have a meeting and decide a policy for Germany, a policy for Italy, and a policy for the United States. These policies are sent to the central committees.

The central committee—the party secretary of the United States calls the district committee, and they have a discussion to clarify themselves on these instructions from the executive committee in Moscow. Then these are sent down to the district organizer, and he, in turn, calls a meeting to clarify them, so that every party member in every unit gets clarified on this policy from Moscow.

The section committee is an important function. That is a part of the district, and for illustration I will use the Ford committee in the Ford section of Detroit. That committee is made up of delegates from the various units, the shop unit and the other units which comprise this section committee.

In the unemployed section of unemployed workers he forms a committee, and the members of the committee in the shop are responsible for the union activities in that shop.

In a strike situation then all the units function in unison.

First, the district committee in a strike situation meets practically 20 hours a day. Every little situation that arises calls them together and then they have a meeting on it. They give that section committee members assigned to this particular plant on strike. Every detail of strike strategy is worked out, and the member's duty and obligation in a factory is to build around himself a group of known party workers.

He must conduct himself in a way to win their confidence, and to show that he is aggressive, and, naturally, being politically trained and trained in strike strategy and policy, he knows how to carry on the work with the workers in the plant. Therefore, he wins and holds this confidence, and it is generally accepted that the mass of workers will respond to the party leadership in the plant.

I will use this as an example. This is not my testimony, but I talked to people whom I know.

Take a certain plant in the city of Detroit, one of the strongest organized plants in the city. Out of twelve or fifteen thousand workers, when they hold an election for the union local, around 1,400 or 1,500 votes being cast, the Communists were able to control the local. I do not know what the membership is, but I would be willing to wager that they do not have more than 50 party members in the entire plant, but the 50 party members control the union election of twelve or fourteen hundred votes, because each one takes it upon himself to get a following of so many, and these 15 or 20 party members are concentrating their efforts on the same identical lines. This man is working on one part of the factory and this man working on another part, all on the same policies, so when they go into an organization meeting with their resolutions, they are the first to get up and the first to discuss the resolutions. This one will get up and speak over here and another one over there.

Then they have their militant element: still opposed to Communism, they want to fight, they want a union, and they want these resolutions, because the resolutions are made purposely to sound good to them. They will get up and support the discussions of the Communists in this meeting.

Therefore, it enables a group of 10 or 12 or 15 Communists to control a large mass of people who would be opposed to communism if the correct methods were used in exposing them as members of the Communist Party.

Then they have a method of organizing whispering campaigns. If they are going to elect officers of a local union, as to the ones are going to be nominated against the men they want, they organize a whispering campaign around this man or these men and lend their influence among the workers in the plant.

Then they will use another policy to keep the voters as low as possible, and by so doing lower the vote, and increase their chances, because their influence only covers a certain phase.

That, I believe, tells you about the structure of the party and how they work.

In a strike situation, when a strike breaks out in a plant, they will draw up things that are to be done. They will organize defense committees; they will organize committees that get on the streets and block them off so that the police, or any other interference, cannot get in there.

They will have a committee at all the fire hydrants so that the fire department cannot connect the fire hose. All these things that could be done against them in a strike are guarded against ahead of time.

The whole theory, and their teaching, is that no detail is too small.

I do not know if you think of any more questions to ask. I have just a few notes.

The CHAIRMAN. In connection with this party structure, who appoints the central committee of the Communist Party in New York?

Mr. PACE. They are elected at a national party conference.

The CHAIRMAN. Elected by the members at a national party conference?

Mr. PACE. Yes; delegates are sent from various districts into a party conference. The central committee is elected by them, with the entire central bureau, but the bureau is the main function. It is

composed of 8, 9, or 12 members, and they are elected by the committee itself.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean the bureau?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They meet constantly?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, a committee of the executive committee of the Communist Party?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir; of the central committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The executive committee, or the central committee, of the Communist Party, selects this small group known as the bureau?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They actually run the party?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir; and the same policy is carried down through the organization.

The district committee is elected by the district convention, and four or five of the leading political leaders of the party form the bureau of the district committee, and the district committee is hardly ever more known. It is these four or five political heads who run the whole show.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us assume that on the central committee some one is selected who is not acceptable to the executive committee at Moscow; what would happen?

Mr. PACE. He does not function. The national organizer, people who hold that position, like Foster and Browder, must be acceptable to Moscow.

The CHAIRMAN. Moscow has the right to remove them at will.

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You say the executive committee of the Communist Party in Moscow decides on these questions of policy for each respective country; is that right?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Then that policy is transmitted to the central committee of the particular country affected?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us assume that the executive committee at Moscow decides on a policy for the United States; that policy is transmitted to the central committee of the Communist Party of the United States. Does the central committee adopt that policy?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir; without question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it mandatory on the central committee to adopt that policy?

Mr. PACE. I cannot say it is mandatory; in a sense it is mandatory, and yet, with the whole ideological training of their members in being trained as Communists and reaching that high stage, they unconsciously accept the political theory of the Communist International.

The CHAIRMAN. When the central committee of the Communist Party of the United States receives that instruction, they, in turn, transmit it to the other committees, the State and district committees?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Throughout the country?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the district committee transmits it to the sections?

Mr. PACE. To the sections, and the sections to the unions.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you say with reference to whether or not the Communist Party of the United States is under the control of the executive committee of the Third Internationale.

Mr. PACE. It is, absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. They are under that control?

Mr. PACE. All the way. Any time a Communist Party of any country would refuse to be controlled by the executive committee they would be expelled from the Communist International and would not be a part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the international solidarity fund? In the membership group there are certain fees paid to the international solidarity fund.

Mr. PACE. That is for the international solidarity of the working class. That means that all nationalities and all races are one, especially socially.

The CHAIRMAN. When you pay in your dues to the international solidarity fund, who gets those dues?

Mr. PACE. I do not know the division of it. Your dues are collected by your unit, and your unit keeps a percentage of that, and percentage goes to the section committee and the district committee. This percentage to the district committee—of course, their dues are in a lump sum, and then there is a percentage of that that goes to the central committee in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the central committee send any part of the dues to the executive committee of the Communist International?

Mr. PACE. That I do not know. I know that the dues of the Communist Party here is not a big item. It is a very small item, but they have a policy of collecting funds that is, in my opinion, unequaled. The funds that the Communist Party collects run into the millions.

The CHAIRMAN. Explain how that is done?

Mr. PACE. They have all different forms. They will put on tag days. They will just pick up some special occasion like a free Tom Mooney fund. They will start a national drive later and get thousands of dollars said to be for the freedom of Tom Mooney, but the money is never used for Tom Mooney. They collected several hundred thousand dollars in that single case.

About every 5 or 6 months there would be a successful drive put on, and they would use tag boxes to collect funds.

Like in the case of the Ford hunger march, people that were killed in the Ford hunger march, they had plaster statues made of them and shipped from town to town, and they raised the question of workers' tombstones. There were thousands of dollars collected by them for that purpose and no tombstone was ever bought. They will start a fund to help the strikers, where the strikers are not helped.

I am not in a position, I do not know enough of it today to know just how the distribution of this money is made.

I have heard discussions in high political bureaus of where the money was sent to Russia to help a certain trade union movement, and where countries are strong enough financially to give financial aid, they send it to the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union will send financial aid to the weaker countries that need the finances.

Mr. MOSIER. They also collect a great deal for the Spanish Loyalists or they have collected a great deal?

Mr. PACE. Yes; any issue that they think the public will be in sympathy with they will raise money on for the purpose of collecting finances. They have carried on a campaign drive for the defense of the Jewish people in Germany and the refugees. They will use any issue that can gain or win any part of public sympathy.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about the change of the policy in the United States by the Communist Party, the so-called "Trojan horse" policy?

Mr. PACE. I know how the change was brought about. I did not stay in the party after the change was put into practice.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us how it was brought about.

Mr. PACE. In 1934—I am not sure it was 1934, but I think it was—they held a general party conference in New York City where 8 or 10 leading political members from each district were called in to New York. This was on the resolution of the executive committee of the Communist International that the Communist Party of America abolish the policy of organizing dual unions.

In other words, they had at that time a trade union unity league, which was a league of all their various revolutionary unions, like the textile union, the steel union, and the mine union, and the auto workers' union, and they formed their unions into a league which was a council of all these unions, in New York City.

I was in the meeting in Detroit when the representatives of the central committee came to Detroit to lay out that policy to our membership. They organized what they called a broad party membership, a broad district committee meeting of about 50 or 75 of the leading political figures in Michigan, and Jack Stechel, who was a leader of the trade union unity league, a leader of the trade-union movement for the party, came to that district and outlined this policy, and with a resolution which was to put all the forces, not only Communists but other union members of the auto workers' union into the American Federation of Labor union for the purpose of carrying on a campaign for the Committee on Industrial Organization; in other words, to form a union that would absorb production industrial workers.

It is my opinion that this brought about an opportunity for the organization of the C. I. O. because they had a demand which was great for that type of union, the A. F. of L. being more or less of a craft union of skilled workers, not taking in the great mass of production workers. So this policy was formulated. They had the American Federation of Labor, but they thought that was the road to the right that they would not accept, and there was a great percentage of workers not eligible for membership in the A. F. of L.

They had a trade union, the unity league, on the left, and the Communist union was the only other road for them to follow, and they followed it.

In 1933 the Communist Party made great improvements in the union because of the general dissatisfaction with general conditions.

So the C. I. O. was formed as a middle road, a road they would accept.

Well, that was all right, but they came in so fast and the union filled up so rapidly that the leaders found themselves in the predica-

ment of not having any experienced people who knew anything about organization, so they had to rely on Communist organizers, and they had to use Communist organizers until they got the union built, and then they kicked them out.

But the Communists are not dumb; when it comes to organization they can beat the leaders of the C. I. O. about organization. I am not giving them any credit but I think we want the facts, and we have to accept the facts, and that was my intention when I came down here.

The result has been that the Communists have just about been able to gain control. Instead of them using the Communists until they got these unions organized and then kicking them out, the Communist committee got control and kicked them out, and that is about what is happening now.

On the other hand, Lovestone, who split away from the Communist Party in 1919—no, later than that—Lovestone has organized his own group, and the head of the right wing function of the U. A. W., or the C. I. O., they could not go with the Communists, because Lewis had them, so he had to go to Lovestone, and it looks like the Lovestone faction can be quite an influence in the right wing movement of the C. I. O., based upon my experience and my knowledge of how these factions function. That is the picture I get.

Still, it is my opinion that the C. P. O., or Lovestone faction, is not determining, because they are all theory. The Lovestone theory is that the change in the capitalist system can be brought about, or can only be brought about, by abolition, and so long as he holds to that theory he will never be determining, because he has no organization.

Where the Communists are the determining organization, they are the ones that will continue to grow, regardless of what we think or do about it. The Communists will continue to grow.

Of course, that is going to lead up now to the matter of finding ways and means of how to deal with these dissatisfied people and reestablish Americanism into their minds. That is the picture as I see it right now.

The CHAIRMAN. What happened to the trade union unity league after the new policy was agreed upon?

Mr. PACE. It was dissolved.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did the Communist members go?

Mr. PACE. Into the already organized unions.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they go into the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., both?

Mr. PACE. Yes—they went into the A. F. of L. before the C. I. O. was organized. Their campaign inside the A. F. of L. had a big influence in organizing the C. I. O.

The CHAIRMAN. When the C. I. O. was organized, where did they go.

Mr. PACE. Into the C. I. O. All of their political elements went into the C. I. O. They brought John L. Lewis out of the American Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. What percentage of the organization of the C. I. O. are Communist?

Mr. PACE. Well, that I do not know. All their activities in there have happened since I left the party.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the strategy known as penetration?

Mr. PACE. Boring from within.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they follow that in the educational systems, in the public schools? Do you know anything about that?

Mr. PACE. Not except from general publicity. I know this, by knowing the operation and practices of the Communist Party, that they do not concentrate on it. They are not so particularly interested in that section of the population. There is a lot said about it, but I know they are not so much interested in that. The main concentration of the Communist Party is in the heavy industries and in the Army.

Mr. MASON. That is true, so far as your knowledge is concerned, while you were a member, but if you discontinued your membership since 1934, many things have happened since then, and perhaps by now the Communist Party are centering their attention among other organizations besides labor unions. Would you say that might be true?

Mr. PACE. Yes; to a certain degree, but yet I am not saying they are not concentrating on that, just because I have got out since 1934. Once you have been in there and learned the political theory of the Communist Party, you can almost say just what is going on by just watching their movement. For instance, if I would be a subscriber to the Daily Worker and Communist International and have kept myself informed, I would have been able to get out today and tell every move they are making. If I went to Chicago or to Cleveland to any of their demonstrations and heard five or six speakers speak, I could tell you in 3 minutes which ones are Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. Why?

Mr. PACE. I do not know why, but it seems easy, if you are trained, because they have certain language. The same speech made in New York City is made in every section committee meeting. Every Communist takes the same line and uses the same language, and when a policy is formed the Communist in Detroit is making the same speech as the Communist in Cleveland.

On this question that he raised, now, there are people of the anti-type who, for some reason or other, become interested in communism, and these people are not suitable for any other work except among their own people, and naturally they are assigned to work within the schools or within that category in which they belong, and to that extent, and that extent only—they would not have a Communist using any time in an educational system; he is too valuable to their main objective, and their main objective is the control of the heavy industries.

The CHAIRMAN. When they agitate for a strike, what do they have in mind, the betterment of labor or working conditions? What is their objective?

Mr. PACE. They will pick out five or six slogans, "Want 15 cents an hour increase in wages," or they will want the work slowed down with a certain percentage of shorter hours. These slogans are in support of the workers.

In the first place, the Communists know the sentiments of the workers. They are supposed to find out just what the dissensions are, what the workers are dissatisfied with, and, based upon these grievances, they formulate programs of action. They do not want

higher wages or cheaper rents, because if the people had those advantages they would not care a rap about communism, but they use those as a means of propaganda for calling a strike.

Then, in the course of a strike, the Communist element know how to promote a fight; they know how to carry themselves to the point of where they will use some underhanded provocation measure to cause the police to attack them, and then they will start certain activities like hollering and screaming and making a lot of noise, to gain sympathy for the strikers and to get out and fight back at the police. The Communist theory of teaching is to develop struggles and how to fight in order to be successful in the overthrow of the Government. That is what they want. That is the object. They want a certain percentage of that done in every strike situation, in every form of struggle that they have.

The CHAIRMAN. How do they believe that they may accomplish their objective in the United States? What I mean is this. Do they hope to achieve communism through peaceful means or through force and violence?

Mr. PACE. Their theory is that it cannot be achieved peacefully. Their theory is that the capitalist class will not give up what they have peacefully. That is their theory; that is their teaching; that is their doctrine.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been any change of attitude with references to revolution? This Trojan-horse policy has not affected their attitude on revolution in any respect, is that right?

Mr. PACE. No. Their teaching is that nothing else but revolution will gain control of the Government.

Now, in the heavy industries, the Communists do not want a mass movement. They do not want a big union. I have been watching a little bit—not an awful lot—the Pittsburgh convention. It seems to me that they have just about got complete control of that convention. That is the way it looks to me. They want the U. A. W. split up. They want this organization where they can completely dominate it, or they want only that section which they can dominate. They will split up the U. A. W. I am willing to make that prediction and you gentlemen can see afterward what happens. Because it is their doctrine, it is their policy that out of every struggle, as they say, we want to build a party, because the party will be the political leader and guider in the revolution. They want a strong party cadre. They want every member of the party to know what the revolution is, to know how to organize the revolution. They cannot do that with a mass movement that they cannot control.

So, in the process of building the U. A. W., or picking out those elements that will accept their program, and building their party out of these activities of the union, they have that in mind; and after they have built their party to a certain degree, you will see the Communists lag back for a while. They will not be so active in the union activities. They are training these new people to be bona fide Communist members. Then when their party is built another step or two they will flood back into mass organization action. They are not figuring on a revolution today or tomorrow. They are preparing for it when it does come, step by step. And the Communists do not have anything to do with what they cannot control. When they control it,

they will control every resolution from the top down and see that it is carried out, without any question.

The CHAIRMAN. You said something about their working with the Army. What do you mean by that?

Mr. PACE. Well, for instance, we will take the city of Detroit. We have the National Guard at Fort Wayne, within the city of Detroit. We have the Young Communist League organized, which is a political party organization of the Communist Party for young people. And in this they get several girls of high-school age—18, 19, 20 years old, on up to 26 and 27 years old. These girls, probably five or six of them, will be assigned to make contacts inside of the National Guard unit. Well, they will meet these fellows, they will go together, they will go to a beer garden, associate with them, and win their friendship. Then they will get a group together and they will start telling them, little by little, "What do you want to be cannon fodder for? Don't you know what you are stepping into? Don't you remember what your dad, or other people, perhaps, went through in 1917 and 1918?"

And they will start to propagandize against war. They will first try to turn them against war and show them that there are no benefits to be derived from their participation in the Army.

If they get them sold, once they succeed in getting them sold against war, they will organize them into a group. Then they will meet with this group at regular intervals and instruct them how to carry out the campaign among the other members of the National Guard, among the soldiers in the camp.

In that way, by slowly worming from within, they will have them bring other fellows out, meet these people, and the first thing you know, they have a pretty well-developed Communist meet with them, give them instructions as to how to organize, how to organize a corps inside of the Army.

For instance, during the revolution in Russia they had units organized all through the Russian Army, and when the revolution came they had ways and means of flooding the Army with literature, with such slogans as: "You are only fighting your brothers. We are all workers. We all belong to the same class. Why should we fight each other?"

That is the kind of campaign they carried on, and I would say that 80 to 85 percent of the Russian Army turned over on the side of the revolutionists. Of course, I am speaking of a country where they had a lot different situation than we have here. But, nevertheless, it can be very effective in our Army here, too—very effective.

Mr. MASON. Before we get away from this matter of the Army, you have given us a picture of the theoretical methods by which the Communists may, and probably have, bored from within the National Guard and the Army. Have you concrete evidence with reference to any particular station where that has been done, so that your theory can be backed up by actual experience or facts that will prove that that has been done and is being done?

Mr. PACE. No, sir. I had a suitcase full of records, minutes of actions during my time in the Communist Party, and 2 years ago my house burned and I lost the whole business.

Mr. MASON. And these records were in connection with the National Guard and this work that you have described?

Mr. PACE. Yes. I had minutes of meetings in Delray on the west side, where Nidia Barker, who is an active member of the Communist Party in Detroit, and a highly developed Communist, politically, and Mary Imhoff were assigned for a while to work in the National Guard in Detroit. That is a specific case. I know there were units organized in the National Guard in Delray.

The CHAIRMAN. When you were in the Communist Party, did you meet and know Mr. Weinstone?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What position did he hold?

Mr. PACE. District organizer.

The CHAIRMAN. Of what district?

Mr. PACE. District 7—Detroit, Mich.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you meet Roy and Victor and Walter Reuther?

Mr. PACE. No; I never knew the Reuther boys.

The CHAIRMAN. You never knew them?

Mr. PACE. No.

Mr. MOSIER. Is Lovestone in the United States now?

Mr. PACE. I do not know for sure whether he is or not.

Mr. MOSIER. His work is?

Mr. PACE. His work is going on now.

The CHAIRMAN. Who were some of the most active Communists during the time you were in the Communist Party?

Mr. PACE. The first district organizer was a fellow by the name of Fisher. He was just in there for a couple or three weeks after I joined the party. I did not see him but once or twice.

Then there was Baker. Baker is going under an alias now. I do not know what that alias is, but at that time he was known as Baker. Baker was the district organizer. After him was John Schmiese. He was in the Cleveland district, in the trade-union movement. Then after Schmiese came Weinstone. But the political figures in there I think would be on the list of names that you have; Weinstone, Earl Reno, Philip Raymond, who I think spent 2 years in Lenin University in Moscow; and then these two girls that I just mentioned, Nidia Barker and Mary Imhoff. They are the two leading women political workers in the district. They are both well versed in communism and the Marxist theory and have both gone to the national school and have also been active in the movement for about 10 years.

Mr. MOSIER. Where is the national school?

Mr. PACE. In New York. Then there was a Max Salzman.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know anything about the Trotskyite group that operates in Mexico?

Mr. PACE. Not an awful lot. They do not amount to anything. We used to tell them in Detroit, when there were more than five conventions, they could not cover them all. There is no danger in the Trotskyites.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever have any experience with the League Against War and Fascism?

Mr. PACE. Some. I was a member of the district committee in the League Against War and Fascism in Detroit. But I do not know very much about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Were there many Communists in that league at the time you were there?

Mr. PACE. Well, there were Communists assigned to it. When you get up into an organization of that kind, you find that the Communists have a group of sympathizers who sympathize with the Communist Party activity, but do not belong to the party—people like Maurice Sugar—I forget the names. I know some of the people. I do not know their names, never did know them, because I never did work with this intellectual group to amount to anything. But they had a druggist in Detroit who has been very active in all of these statistical groups, professional groups, and intellectual groups.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they undertake to penetrate or permeate political parties or organizations?

Mr. PACE. The only one—the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. No; what I mean is do they undertake to go into the Democratic or Republican Parties for the purpose of obtaining any control over them? Do you know anything about that activity?

Mr. PACE. No; I do not know anything about that. But I do know that some members of the party ran for precinct delegates in the city of Detroit in this last election last fall.

Mr. MASON. Delegates on the Republican or Democratic tickets?

Mr. PACE. Mostly on the Democratic ticket. There was a colored fellow that I met and talked to at a party meeting, a general political meeting, and he informed me he was a candidate for delegate on the Democratic ticket. He was an active Communist member in the colored section.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they do much work among the colored people?

Mr. PACE. Quite a bit.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that part of their program?

Mr. PACE. Quite a bit. They concentrate pretty heavily on the Negro race.

The CHAIRMAN. How do they do it? Do you know anything about their tactics and methods?

Mr. PACE. The same tactics they use in any other form of organization, except that they will take Negro members, maybe who have not belonged but a short time, but they will place them in high offices. They do not have much to say, but they are there just to make a showing, to show the Negro people that they have equal representation in all their activities, just like they have John Ford as a member of the central committee. They pick up Negroes locally and place them as members of the district committee, make them members of the district committee, of the unemployed councils, of trade-union groups, and they fight against what they call white chauvinism. They will even expel a white party member for discriminating against Negroes in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they preach social equality?

Mr. PACE. They preach social equality. They have had three or four weddings in Detroit, where a Negro man and a white woman were married, in order to illustrate how they were breaking down this race hatred and race prejudice, to show that their policy or their theory calls for that sort of equality. But I understand now from reading about it, that the Communist Party has also adopted a policy of self determination in the black belt. In fact, they passed that resolution before I left the party, establishing self determination in the black belt.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you lead a march on Washington at any time?

Mr. PACE. The bonus march of the veterans in 1932.

The CHAIRMAN. You led the bonus march? That was while you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the Communists organize that march?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir; that is from Michigan. I am not talking about nationally.

The CHAIRMAN. You led the Michigan group?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many did you have in your group?

Mr. PACE. Four hundred and fifty. That is another example of how 5 Communists led 450 World War veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. Were there just five communists?

Mr. PACE. There were five Communists in the entire group.

The CHAIRMAN. And the five Communists organized the march and conducted it and arranged everything?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the veterans know that that was being done?

Mr. PACE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Who were the five Communists? Can you tell us who the other four were?

Mr. PACE. No; I cannot. I can only tell you three. I know the other two, but I do not know their names. Walter Eiker; he is now active in the W. P. A. union in Detroit, and myself and a colored fellow by the name of Woods.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know his first name?

Mr. PACE. I do not know his first name.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do not know the names of the other two?

Mr. PACE. No. There are a lot of party members who have an alias. They go under an assumed name and they are liable to go under that for a year and their next membership card will carry another name.

The CHAIRMAN. What percentage of them in the party are in under their true name, do you know?

Mr. PACE. I do not know what the percentage is, but it is small.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you in under your true name?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You were in under your right name?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. MASON. This Eiker who you say was with you is now working where?

Mr. PACE. He is in the W. P. A. union, a branch of the A. U. W.

Mr. MOSIER. Are the Communists doing any organizational work among the W. P. A. workers?

Mr. PACE. They have their W. P. A. union.

The CHAIRMAN. The W. P. A. union is a branch of the Workers Alliance, is it? Or do you know whether it is?

Mr. PACE. I do not know about that. I do not know this Workers Alliance. I have not inquired about that. When I left in 1934 I left everything and I did not pay much attention to it. The only thing I have learned of what has been happening since is just by meeting individuals whom I formerly knew, who are still members of the party, who are not afraid to talk to me on the streets.

The CHAIRMAN. What have you done since 1934?

Mr. PACE. In 1934 and 1935 I worked for the W. P. A. as a clerk. In 1937 and 1938 I have worked for the liquor commission.

Mr. MOSIER. Of the State of Michigan?

Mr. PACE. Of the State of Michigan.

Mr. MASON. I wanted to inquire more about the W. P. A. union. It is a local union of W. P. A. workers, is that it?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. It is not a union of workers working in private industry, such as the automobile industry, is it?

Mr. PACE. No; but they have their connection. During this seasonal unemployment, a man may belong to the W. P. A. union today and tomorrow he is called back into the shop and he is transferred from that union to the shop union. They have their connections. That is why I say they can call it the Workers Alliance, if they want to, but I know that the W. P. A. union was first sponsored by the U. A. W.

The CHAIRMAN. During the time you were in the Communist Party, was there any growth in the membership?

Mr. PACE. That is one of the biggest problems the Communist Party has, what they call fluctuation. They are in today and they are out tomorrow, just the same as I was. You see, you get in there under certain circumstances, during a period of complete dissatisfaction; not complete dissatisfaction so much, but a loss of confidence. You have lost confidence in the Government to protect you. You lose confidence in anybody else helping you when you are down. And you say, "All right, we are going to stand up and fight."

Then they get in there and they go through certain processes. Well, that is all right, because after all, the Communists know how to train these people. Then when you begin to learn what a government would be under Communist rule, you begin to think. I know that I began to change my mind during the bonus march in 1932. I had quite a few fights with the leadership of the Communist Party in connection with the bonus march.

For instance, I averted a couple or three riots in Washington. I had instructions not to, but I did, anyway, because I knew it was not right. It was not even right from their point of view.

The Communist Party does not have members that disagree with them. There are no individual opinions in the Communist Party. There is no such thing as an individual opinion. Any opinion that is handed down is an opinion that has been discussed and decided in a committee. Not even Earl Browder himself would come in here and make the statement that he would not positively know the central committee would support or agree with. They do not have personal opinions.

So I had my personal opinions, and I carried them out, and then I began to develop, and I was put on the pan in New York City. I was called there, and they had a hearing. I went in there, and I stood my ground, and I told them that I would not carry out such a program.

After all, they had a lot of principles that I never did agree with on the inside that I had to support on the outside.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that they called you before a meeting in New York?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. When did that take place?

Mr. PACE. That took place, I believe it was in August 1932 after the bonus march. I was arrested in Washington at that time, during the picketing of the White House. I was not out when the evacuation orders were carried out. After I came out, then I went to New York City and was questioned.

The CHAIRMAN. What kind of a meeting was it that the Communists held when they had you before them?

Mr. PACE. I was before Browder and Clarence Hathaway. Clarence Hathaway was at that time the editor of the Daily Worker; and a fellow by the name of Pass.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe he is one of those mentioned as one of the directors of the League for Peace and Democracy. What did they tell you when you came before them?

Mr. PACE. Well, about violating party policies and party rules, not carrying out decisions of the party.

Mr. MOSIER. That is, Mr. Pace, I understand that you averted riots in Washington and they did not want you to do that. Will you tell us again what that was?

Mr. PACE. For instance, they organized a parade. They wanted a parade on a certain day down Pennsylvania Avenue to the Capitol. I knew that it would end in a riot. I knew that it would because there were conservative contingents along Pennsylvania Avenue. For instance, at Twenty-third and Pennsylvania, they had a southern delegation there from Texas and, I think, Oklahoma. This group was a conservative group. Of course, our group was branded as the "reds," up at Thirteenth and B. I had contacts in that regiment down there and I knew that they were going to come out and start a fight. So I called off the parade. I was chairman of the district committee in the left-wing movement, of the bonus march, and I called off the parade. I called it off on two different occasions when I knew it was going to end in a fight; that is, I did not call it off, I just got up before them and told them what would happen, and I had enough influence among them to have them vote against it.

Mr. MOSIER. They wanted a parade and they wanted a fight, is that it?

Mr. PACE. Surely.

Mr. MOSIER. And that was what they put you on the pan for in New York afterwards?

Mr. PACE. Yes. That is where I began to study the things that were wrong, because under the Communist rule, in Russia, there is no such thing as individual liberty. They even teach that, they teach that in order to establish their class of society, you have to destroy all individual liberty. There is no such thing as your personal ends or wishes at all. You work as one body. Whatever they think, you accept it.

Now, in connection with these heavy industries, for instance, their concentration points, like steel and metal industries and the automobile industries, concentrating on them, first as a preparation against war, their policy would be to organize a union and control a union in these industries, and also transportation, so that in the event of a war, they would be able to close these plants and stop

production of war materials and cripple the Government in its participation in a war, and also to stop transportation.

That is why they have concentrated so much in the last 7 or 8 years on the marine workers on the coast, to be able to stop shipments of soldiers and shipments of war materials and munitions.

The CHAIRMAN. That is only in case we were to go to war with Russia; that is, they would not utilize that in a war with Germany. They are very much in favor of a war with Germany, are they not? Or are they?

Mr. PACE. Their philosophy is opposed to all wars. Their belief is this, that the longer capitalism has to stay out of war, the weaker it becomes. That is their theory. They figure that war is an essential thing in capitalism, in the fight between the monopolistic powers; for instance, Germany tries to hog up too much of territory, and they start getting into some United States concessions, or those of France or England, and they come into disagreement. Their opinion is that these wars are necessary for the division of the world's productive forces, to establish new markets. They want to fight against war. The longer they can stop them from fighting, the better position they are in. And Russia has carried out that policy of non-aggression ever since the establishment of their government. They do not want war, because they are preparing and building every day, while the other countries are fighting over the economic situation among themselves. That is what they want.

Now, I do not know whether you want facts or whether you want opinions. I have expressed a lot of opinions, and I would like to express another one on a matter that I think has been of great public interest.

I have seen newspaper articles and have heard statements by several speakers and a good deal of public comment condemning France and England for selling out Czechoslovakia.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us not go into that. Is there anything else that you have? Do you have any questions, Mr. Mosier?

Mr. MOSIER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that will be all. You were brought here under subpoena, were you not?

Mr. PACE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that will be all, and the committee thanks you very much for your testimony.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN C. METCALFE

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Metcalfe, you testified yesterday with reference to a man named Charles Bruce Swift, of Pittsburgh, Pa., who is an organier, I believe you said, of the Silver Shirts. Since your testimony here yesterday, have you had occasion to confer with the Naval Intelligence Officer with regard to this man's activities?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you tell us what your conference disclosed?

Mr. METCALFE. I conferred with them yesterday afternoon, and there were several points that were raised that I should forward to you—that is, that the committee be informed by the Office of Naval

Intelligence that all points in the evidence regarding the activities of Swift are found to be substantially correct; that the Navy Department discovered, however, upon investigation that Swift has been engaged in intelligence work, not as an official staff officer, but as a Reserve officer, EVS, which means the Engineer Volunteer Service. Naval Intelligence further learned that Swift apparently has been flashing fake naval intelligence credentials, and that he has been acting largely without authority from our knowledge of the Navy Department.

It is believed probable by Naval Intelligence that Swift has in his possession outdated intelligence cards that he obtained from the Naval Intelligence files which had been turned over to him in 1937 by the late Commander Horatio Dohrman. You will recall it was stated yesterday that it was Commander Dohrman who had been doing the intelligence work in the Pittsburgh area for a number of years, and that Swift succeeded Commander Dohrman about a year ago. He was appointed by Admiral Puleston.

The Naval Intelligence Office further informs the committee that it is familiar with the sundry activities of the Silver Shirts or like organizations, such as the German-American Bund, the Knights of the White Carmelia, and so forth. It wishes the committee to know that a thorough investigation is being made of Swift's activities at Pittsburgh, and Naval Intelligence also thanks the committee for its cooperation and investigation into this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. They authorized you to say that to us?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. These were conversations, and so forth, in which we turned over our files and complete data. They had already been active in the investigation. The commander who asked that this message be conveyed to you is Commander E. B. Nixon, United States Naval Intelligence Office.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one point with reference to the testimony about this man that I cannot reconcile in my mind, or that I cannot understand, and that is why Swift told you that he was bringing subversive leaders to Pittsburgh. Assuming that Swift was engaged in this kind of work, it seems incredible to me that he would himself admit that his work was subversive, and that the people he was bringing in were subversive. What is your explanation of that?

Mr. METCALFE. He used that term with a smile on his face, recognizing the term as having been used by the press and submitted in the testimony right along—that these people are known as subversive.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, is it correct to assume, or is it your interpretation of it, that he used that term not in a serious sense, but as deriding the efforts that are being made to show up those subversive activities?

Mr. METCALFE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. I wanted to find out about that.

Mr. METCALFE. It is not because he personally believes them to be subversive, but because he recognized that everybody else thinks that they are.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee was very much puzzled by that testimony.

We will now suspend until 1:30 o'clock.

(Thereupon, the committee took a recess until 1:30 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

The committee reconvened at 1:30 p. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

TESTIMONY OF FELIX (PAT) J. MCCARTNEY

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. What is your name?

Mr. MCCARTNEY. My right name is Felix J. McCartney. I am called Pat McCartney.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you live?

Mr. MCCARTNEY. At the present time I live on West Grand Boulevard, Detroit.

The CHAIRMAN. You were subpoenaed here, were you not?

Mr. MCCARTNEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The report that reached the Chair was that you did not want to appear.

Mr. MCCARTNEY. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you explain why you did not want to appear before the committee and testify?

Mr. MCCARTNEY. Yes, sir; I could.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to explain it?

Mr. MCCARTNEY. Yes, sir. There are several reasons why I did not wish to appear before the committee here. One reason is that certain pamphlets were passed out to the employees of the automobile plant at which I work. Those pamphlets inflamed the minds of the working people at the plant against this committee. There is one pamphlet I have here which I would like to produce at this time as evidence.

The CHAIRMAN. What was it about?

Mr. MCCARTNEY. The heading of the pamphlet was, "Who is the Dies Committee, and Who Are the People Who Testify Before the Dies Committee?" Then it went on to state the names of several people who testified before this committee, and their records as labor spies, and people who have denounced labor in every form. Then below the names of those people were the names of four or five people connected with the civil rights, labor unions, and so forth, who were to give a talk at one of the big auditoriums in the city of Detroit condemning the Dies committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Who distributed that pamphlet to you?

Mr. MCCARTNEY. I cannot state that all the pamphlets were distributed by Communist people, or people who belonged to the Communist Party, but some of the people who distributed those pamphlets were Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were you born?

Mr. MCCARTNEY. There is another point I would like to bring out, if you do not mind.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. MCCARTNEY. Personally, I am a strong supporter of Gov. Frank Murphy, the present Governor, and it appeared to the working class of people in the plants that when the Dies committee brought into the light the aspect of the Detroit and Flint situation it embarrassed politically the union's campaign for Governor Murphy's

reelection. In that respect it looked bad in the sight of things if I myself came here to testify, and I want it stated here that I am a strong supporter of Gov. Frank Murphy.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any further volunteer statement you want to make?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir; there is another one or additional reason: The Plymouth plant at which I work is the hotbed of communism in the U. A. W. A., and in testifying here I put myself in such a position that at most any time anything may happen, and, of course, I am married and have a little boy. For that reason, I want it brought out in the light that as one reason why I refused to come before the committee until I was subpoenaed.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were you born?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I was born at Washington, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. How old are you now?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Twenty-nine years of age.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you move to Detroit?

Mr. McCARTNEY. In the summer of 1928.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were you living when you moved to Detroit?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I was living at Washington, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. You have lived all the time at Washington, Pa.?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I make a correction there. My family lived at Washington, but I moved to Newcastle, Pa., where I worked for approximately 1 year.

The CHAIRMAN. What work were you doing?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Plumbing and heating. That is my trade.

The CHAIRMAN. What has been your education?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I have a 2 years' high-school education.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you have it?

Mr. McCARTNEY. At the Immaculate Conception High School.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a Catholic?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir; a Roman Catholic.

The CHAIRMAN. Your work has been largely in what places? You say you have worked at Newcastle, Detroit, and at what other places?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Practically all of my work has been done in Washington, Pa., and Detroit. I spent 1 year in Newcastle and approximately 4 months in a small town in Pennsylvania called Nowe.

The CHAIRMAN. You were doing what?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Pipe work or plumbing.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you first go to work for Plymouth?

Mr. McCARTNEY. The first time I went to work there I think was in 1931, and then, of course, I got an attack of stomach ailment and took sick leave. From there I went into the reforestation work, or the C. C. C. I was in there for 13 months. From there I was first sergeant and inspector of utilities of the district, or the forestry district.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you go to work for Plymouth?

Mr. McCARTNEY. In 1934. In the fall of 1934 I was rehired in the Plymouth plant.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have been continuously employed there since then.

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What work do you do?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Plumbing and heating. It is commonly known in the plant as pipe fitters' maintenance work.

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately how many men work in the Plymouth factory?

Mr. McCARTNEY. At its full peak, of the laboring class, there are approximately 12,000 people.

The CHAIRMAN. How many work as pipe fitters?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Approximately 90 people.

The CHAIRMAN. You work in a separate department.

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir; that is a department in itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a member of any union?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Of what union?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I am a member of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, the local is Plymouth Local 51.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been a member of that union?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I first joined that union in December 1935 and I paid one of its dues. Then I did not pay any dues again until January 1937. I was reinstated in the union in January 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a member now in good standing?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir; I am a member in good standing.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever hold any office in the union?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I was chairman of the negotiating committee, commonly known as the shop committee of the plant, in the Plymouth local union.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you acquainted with large numbers of the laboring people in the Plymouth factory?

Mr. McCARTNEY. As a matter of fact, I am just about as well acquainted with the laboring class of people in the plant as anybody who works in there.

The CHAIRMAN. Why is that?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Simply because as chairman of the negotiating committee I go around to all the departments, and all the people who had grievances would bring them to the chairman of the negotiating committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, you are in a position to know what has been going on within the plant.

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. You stated a few moments ago that the Plymouth unit or the Plymouth factory was a hotbed of communism; what did you mean by that?

Mr. McCARTNEY. By that I mean that the strategic positions in the local union are held by members of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no hesitancy now, since you are under subpoena, and on the stand under oath, to tell us the facts as you know them?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. And the fact that you are testifying reluctantly will not in any sense cause you to conceal any facts that this committee ought to know.

Mr. McCARTNEY. I do not intend to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. You will tell us the facts.

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir; that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that the Communists hold strategic positions in the union of the Plymouth factory.

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. About how many locals are operating in the Plymouth factory?

Mr. McCARTNEY. There is only one local. That local is No. 51, and it is cut up into districts, of which there are 24 districts in the local union. Over those districts are people known as district chief committeemen, and under them, of course, are the stewards.

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately, how many members are there in that local? Can you give some rough estimate of the number?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I would judge that there are between three and four hundred people now Communists in this local union, but only about 100 really take an active part.

The CHAIRMAN. You are referring to the Communists. How many members does the union have all together?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Out of the 12,000 people?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCARTNEY. I would say there are close to 10,000 people who are paid up in dues and are in good standing in the local union.

The CHAIRMAN. And you say that of the 300 Communist members, about 100 are active: Is that right?

Mr. McCARTNEY. About 100 are active as out and above board in everything. They are leaders and work for the movement at all times.

The CHAIRMAN. Do the other 200 Communists cooperate with them in the movement?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Only in respect of attending meetings of the most important kind, or to vote on vital questions.

The CHAIRMAN. What strategic positions do the Communists hold within the union?

Mr. McCARTNEY. At the present time, in my estimation, the highest position in the local union is held by a man by the name of Mike Duletsky. He is financial secretary of the Plymouth local union, and he has access to the records. As a matter of fact, he looks after the funds and finances, looks after all the records, and gives the members the literature that comes in and goes out of that office.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say that his position is one of the most important in the union?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a strategic position from the standpoint of his ability to propagandize and influence the membership.

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is right. It is one of the reasons I had in mind that the files and the records of the local union office have been used for that purpose. They have picked out the most militant people in the plant to whom to send the Communist literature. As a matter of fact, I have received Communist literature through the mail.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, the financial secretary, having possession of the files and records, uses the membership list for the purpose of disseminating Communist literature.

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You know that has been done?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You know that members of the union have received this Communist literature.

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Literature that would not have been sent unless their names had been furnished to the Communist Party.

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Mike Duletsky a Communist?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He certainly is.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you know that?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He admits it. As a matter of fact, he not only admits it but I know as a fact that he attends the Communist Party meetings and takes a most prominent part in them. I cannot find out what position he holds in the Plymouth unit of the Communist Party. I heard Mr. Pace testify this morning regarding how the Communist Party split up in Detroit, especially in the automobile industry, or automobile plants, or split into units such as the Plymouth unit, the Dodge unit, the Fisher Body unit, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean units of the Communist Party?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir; Mike Duletsky holds a very high position in that unit.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you know that?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Because I have had certain people bring testimony to me, but I do not wish to divulge their names at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. About what age is this man Mike Duletsky?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Mike Duletsky is about 29 years old.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he a forceful speaker?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir; he is a very forceful speaker. He attended Wayne University and was known as the boy wonder. He was a great orator.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he successful in swaying the workers?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Very successful.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they generally know he is a Communist?

Mr. McCARTNEY. No, sir; it is not generally known. As a matter of fact, he has admitted to several of his people, or people who were on the executive board of the local union, that he was Communist; but if it comes out in the open he has sidetracked the issue in different ways.

Mr. Mosier. Is he Polish, or what is his nationality?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He is Russian.

Mr. Mosier. Has he always lived in this country, or do you know?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is a question I cannot answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know a man by the name of Raymond Bascom?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir; but before I get on that there is one other point I want to make or elaborate on in connection with Mike Duletsky. During the Chrysler strike in March 1937 they secured quite a few members to join, or quite a few union members in the Plymouth plant to join, the Communist Party. At one of their meetings one man received a telegram through the mail to come to this meeting. I have that telegram here.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you read the telegram.

MR. McCARTNEY. The telegram is addressed to Paul Benyo, 3022 South Etsen Street, Detroit. It is dated March 27, 1937, and reads as follows:

Come to my place at 10 a. m. Sunday; very urgent.

WALTER CHRISTIE.

Walter Christie at that time was a guide officer of the local union, and a member of the executive board.

The CHAIRMAN. Of what union?

MR. McCARTNEY. Of the executive board of this local union.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he a Communist?

MR. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir; he is a Communist. It so happened that just prior to this meeting it is a fact that Paul Benyo, through Walter Christie, and the president of the local at that time, who was William Frankowski, had joined the Communist Party. That is how Paul Benyo joined the Communist Party. As a matter of fact, I have this evidence of his Communist Party due book, and the information relative to his joining.

The CHAIRMAN. You hold in your possession the original due book in the Communist Party?

MR. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; you may proceed.

MR. McCARTNEY. When Paul Benyo, whose alias name, I would like to say, is P. Burt, went into Christie's home, during the progress of the meeting Mike Duletsky gave a fiery talk and while speaking he said: "I do not give a G. D. for this union; all I am fighting for is my party." In saying so, he held his fist in a clenched form.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the official soviet salute?

MR. McCARTNEY. That is right—that he didn't give a G— damn for the union, but he was fighting for his party—meaning the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Now you have got that. Is there anything to add in that connection before I ask you about some of these other people? I was asking you about Mr. Raymond Bascom, as to who he is.

MR. McCARTNEY. Raymond Bascom: The first time I saw this Raymond Bascom, he was introduced to the executive board by Mike Duletsky as a very intelligent man, and as an educator of several of the local unions, and he made the suggestion to the executive board very strongly—in which he held quite a bit of weight—that we secure the services of this Mr. Bascom as educational director of the local union. This was accepted by the local executive board, and he was voted \$20 a week as salary. Mr. Bascom did not work in the Plymouth plant, and he stated to me later that he had never worked in an automobile factory.

In the course of some of the educational classes that he conducted in the union hall he had charts on the wall where he pointed out how superior the form of government was over in Russia over the capitalistic form of government; how superior they were in producing wheat, food material, and so forth; and that was some of the stuff that was being shot to the union people who really went down there to learn unionism and not communism.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he still there?

MR. McCARTNEY. No; he is not there now. As a matter of fact, when you people came to Detroit, he took the back door out, and where he went to, I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. How long was he there as the educational director? Do you know approximately how long he was there?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I judge a year; 12 months or something like that. Just about 12 months.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he conduct frequent classes?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He was very energetic. He had classes, on the average, 3 or 4 nights a week. He would have a class right after work for the second shift, and then he would have a class in the evening, around 7 o'clock, for the first shift and third shift working in the plant. By that I mean he would have a class, say, at 7 o'clock until probably 9 and 10 o'clock for the first and third shifts; and then immediately following the second shift—they would get out of the plant somewhere about 11 o'clock, and he would hold classes from 11:30 on.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, in these various classes, you say he would take occasion to praise Russia?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The superiority of the Russian Government over the Government of the United States?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Over the capitalistic form of government. In other words, at no time did I know him to bring up the United States Government, but the capitalistic form of government naturally would take in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he an effective speaker?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He is not very forceful in his talk, but he is effective to the extent that he is very well educated.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what university he was a graduate of?

Mr. McCARTNEY. No; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether he held a degree in any university?

Mr. McCARTNEY. No; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether he had ever been in training in Russia?

Mr. McCARTNEY. No; I could not say that, either.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, passing from Mr. Bascom to Mr. Crump, did you know a Mr. Crump?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes; I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you tell us something about Mr. Crump?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I would just like to say this much further on this Ray Bascom relative to his membership in the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. McCARTNEY. He was, when this information came to me—that has just been of late—chairman of the Plymouth unit.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the Communist Party?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is right; chairman of the Plymouth unit of the Communist Party. In other words, they would send educated people out into these plants to get their units constructed on a basic form, and as soon as they were constructed, they would step out and go some place else. And that is the reason, when you people came to town, that is when he stepped out, because he was in this thing so deep that the Communist heads probably figured that it would be better to get some of these people out of the way. There was a group of these people working in the Plymouth plant that lived in one apartment at 200 East Grand Boulevard. That is where this man Barney Crump lived.

The CHAIRMAN. They were all Communists, were they?

Mr. McCARTNEY. They were all Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they all leave Detroit?

Mr. McCARTNEY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. How many?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Just this man Bascom. He stepped out of the picture at the time, to cease firing while you people were in town.

There is another thing further: I noticed in the newspaper that one of these fellows who came back from Spain, that belonged to this Abraham Lincoln Brigade, had given his name for mail to be forwarded to Ray Bascom, 200 Grand Boulevard; and I could not say as a fact—things I don't know, I will tell you; that is, if I do know them, I will tell them to you as a fact; and things that I don't know, I will just bring them out as my opinion—that he was one of the organizers for the people to join up in this Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

The CHAIRMAN. Now let us pass from Mr. Bascom to this Mr. Crump. Tell us what you know about Mr. Crump.

Mr. McCARTNEY. Barney Crump—

The CHAIRMAN. His name is Barney Crump?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Barney is his first name; yes, sir. He is known as the unit organizer for the Communist Party—the Plymouth unit organizer for the Communist Party. The position he holds in the union is an executive board member of the Plymouth local, and he is also a member of the negotiating committee and a district committeeman on the second shift, of one of the districts of which I haven't got the names now.

The CHAIRMAN. Does he hold a very influential position?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He does.

The CHAIRMAN. Does he have a lot of weight with the workers?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He carries quite a bit of weight; yes. As a matter of fact, the position that he now holds—he is a member of the Detroit District Council of the U. A. W.

The CHAIRMAN. He is not a delegate to this convention that is going on in Pittsburgh, is he?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Oh, no; he does not rank that high.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything you want to add about Mr. Crump?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir. In September of 1937 there was a slow-down; an alleged slow-down went on in the plant, and through this slow-down there were a couple of boys fired, that laid frames onto a conveyor. Their names are Rennie Andrus and Robert Toner.

The CHAIRMAN. Robert Toner; T-o-n-e-r?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us about him.

Mr. McCARTNEY. The grievance was handed over to the committee, and at that time I was chairman, and we were not able to do anything, that is, to get him back to work. After this thing had been threshed out to that extent, a man by the name of Hooley, who was a district committeeman of the Plymouth plant, one of the chief committeemen—he took part in the negotiations for approximately 500 people in his district—he approached Toner on the grounds—

The CHAIRMAN. Who approached Toner?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Hooley approached Toner, on the grounds that "The union can't do nothing for you; the company has you black-

listed; you will never get a job; your only salvation now is to join the party."

The CHAIRMAN. The Communist Party?

Mr. McCARTNEY. The Communist Party. He joins the Communist Party and flies away in a cloud for about 4 or 5 months.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean, flies away in a cloud?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Well, he was working strong. He was just working day and night. He was then—I say in a cloud; he took it like a religion; he worked day and night at it, and, Boy! He was a fanatic at it, too. It so happened that they held a dance—the Plymouth unit—and the people who attended were girls who worked in the plant and belonged to the Communist Party, and some colored people. It was just a mixed dance; and during this affair of course they had a few drinks there, one of the girls who works in the plant—her name is Gertie Katznoff; Gertrude Katznoff—

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment. You did not give us the date when this took place.

Mr. McCARTNEY. This took place in January of 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have Hooley's first name?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Harold Hooley.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, what about this dance?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Well, he was sitting in a chair by himself.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was?

Mr. McCARTNEY. This Toner; and, of course, down the floor came this here Gertie Katznoff and some big colored boy dancing together, and it sort of irritated him to the extent that he picked up a marble top table and hit this colored fellow over the head with it, and caused a little insurrection there. So the high officials of the Communist group grabbed hold of him and set him in a big chair and started to explain to him that he did not know just the psychology of free love; and, of course, that started him to thinking, and from that time on he drifted away from the Communist Party. He himself, of course, has given me quite a bit of information regarding the actions of the Communist Party.

Now, since that time they have labeled him as a stool pigeon, a company stool pigeon, and a "red" baiter, and what not.

In the meantime he received a registered letter to appear before the Communist tribunal, the trial board, to be tried as a spy, or words to that effect. That letter at the present time is in the hands of Homer Martin, president of the U. A. W. It has been turned over to him. This letter was signed by Barney Crump as unit organizer of the Communist Party; that is, when you asked me what I knew about Barney Crump, I had to travel around that way in order to bring his name out, see?

Going further on Barney Crump—we might as well just get these one by one—

The CHAIRMAN. Surely.

Mr. McCARTNEY. The edition of the U. A. W. A. paper is put out weekly, and in the Labor Day edition it had several advertisements in there, one of which was put in by a banking system in Detroit, and Edsel Ford's name was connected with this banking system. Another editorial was put in there by a group of manufacturers—some manufacturers' association; and this Barney Crump took this paper and held it up in the air before the people at the meeting and condemned

it as a capitalist paper and that it was edited by no one but rats and stool pigeons. Then he went on to praise the *Midwest Daily Record*. The *Midwest Daily Record* is a paper that is printed around the Great Lakes cities, such as Cleveland, Chicago, and Detroit.

Now, at this same meeting, where he condemned the U. A. W. A. paper, another member, who is now the chairman, the present chairman of the shop committee, by the name of "Pop" Edelen—he is known as "Pop"—put a motion on the floor to accept this *Midwest Daily Record*, which is a Communist paper, as the official guide in the future policies of the local. They also—Barney Crump also—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). When was that—about when?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That was at the meeting of September 4, 1938.

As a matter of fact, every member of the union who went into the hall that day was handed a *Midwest Daily Record*—was given a paper—the *Midwest Daily Record*.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the motion carry?

Mr. McCARTNEY. The motion carried; and in the motion it also stated that this motion would be sent to John L. Lewis, would be sent to the Detroit district council, and also sent to the *Midwest Daily Record*.

The CHAIRMAN. Who pays for the *Midwest Daily Record*? Who paid for that? Did the money come out of the treasury of the union?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I would not like to answer that question. I am not quite positive. I heard words to that effect, but I would not say.

Mr. MASON. May I ask you this: Who pays for the U. A. W. A. paper that this was to take the place of?

Mr. McCARTNEY. The membership. In other words, 5 cents of our dues every month is to be taken out of the per capita tax sent in to the International Union.

Mr. MASON. For these subscriptions to the paper?

Mr. McCARTNEY. For the U. A. W. A. paper.

Mr. MASON. Now, if this paper was substituted for that, would that 5 cents then be paid for this *Midwest* paper; or did you continue to get the U. A. W. A. paper?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir; we continued to get that paper. As a matter of fact, this resolution went to the Detroit district council; it was read before the Detroit district council of the U. A. W., and there it was debated and the resolution was passed; but some time later, approximately 2 weeks, that resolution was rescinded—rescinded by members of the Communist Party—and that was somewhere about the time that I think this Dies committee came to Detroit, too.

Mr. MOSIER. In other words, they got the resolution through the local and put it before the Detroit district council?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And there it was agreed upon, and later it was rescinded?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You say they rescinded it about the time this committee went to Detroit?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Some time, yes; within that time.

Mr. MOSIER. Is the *Midwest Daily Record* now the official paper of your Local No. 51, or in rescinding the resolution did that take it out of the character of being your official paper?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I stated that it was the official paper to follow in the future policies of the local; and elaborating further, the motion was put in the Midwest Daily Record paper just 2 or 3 days following.

Now, they sell these papers at all the exits of the Plymouth plant. In the evening, when these workers come out of the plant and go in to work for the afternoon shift, there is always someone there selling these papers. As a matter of fact, the people I have known have always been connected with the Communist Party. In other words, this man Hooley's wife is the party that is selling the paper at the exit I come out. She is also a member of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. The Midwest Daily Record is a well-known Communist publication, is it not?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is right.

Going further on this paper question, the U. A. W. A. paper is very seldom seen around the local union office. One book that was purchased there by one of the conservative people who do not believe in communism—it was purchased for a reason—was a book known as the S. R. T.—Soviet Russia Today. That book was sold to this gentleman, to this union member, right in the office of the local union—Soviet Russia Today.

Now, that information I had was turned over to a C. I. O. committee about 3 weeks ago. They have the paper that was issued to me on September 4, the Midwest Daily Record. They also have this book, Soviet Russia Today, which I turned over to them as evidence; and in this Soviet Russia Today—I went through it quite authentically, and every page was Stalin and Russia, and all the pictures that were in there were the Communist pictures—Communist clothing, and so forth. As I understand, it is a book that all the information comes directly from Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Is there anything else you want to add along that line, before I go on with some more lines?

Mr. McCARTNEY. No; I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know a man by the name of Mr. Robert—Rowen, is it?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes; there is a Robert Rower—R-o-w-e-r. Robert Rower is one of the chief district committeemen.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the union?

Mr. McCARTNEY. One of the district committeemen in the local union. I stated before that there are 24 districts in the plant, and he controls approximately 600 men; looks after the union business of approximately 600 men.

Now, Robert Rower solicited members for the Communist Party inside the Plymouth plant during working hours, and passed out Communist application cards inside the plant. They would take them up to the rest room, and so forth, and sign them up. Now, the number of his district is district 18, and it is really one of the worst districts in the Plymouth plant. He has been very effective and is very boastful in his manner—that he belongs to the Communist Party. As a matter of fact, he carries a little red book in his pocket which illustrates what benefit the Communist Party is to the laboring class of people, and that it is really the only party that is fighting for labor. He carries this book in his pocket at all times. As a matter of fact, he showed me this book.

Now, relative to these Communist application cards; three men took the application cards down to the local union and turned them in to Mike Duletsky and the president. They demanded to have a meeting; that this fellow either resign or be recalled. The meeting was called. There were approximately 300 people there. This was the first order of business brought up. As soon as it was brought up, Mike Duletsky takes the floor and gives one fiery talk—gives one fiery speech. This man Rower himself doesn't say a word. He doesn't admit or deny that he passed out these Communist application cards. Roy Lamotte, the president of the union and international executive board member of the U. A. W. A., chaired the meeting. He got up and stated that he didn't give a damn whether Toner was a member—excuse me; a correction there; not Toner, but Rower—whether Rower was a member of the Communist Party or not, but he was a damn good union member.

So it so happened through the cleverness and intelligence of the Communist Party, that one fellow gets up, stands up quick, and moves, "I move we close debate." Another seconds it, and away it goes. No one else is allowed to talk. So this fellow here was just clear, and he is still district committeeman of that district.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he very influential among the membership?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes; he is. It is very odd how these people work. Now, naturally, being in your position, you don't notice it as much as I do, being a workingman. You notice how much difference. [Laughter.] I mean working with the hands, down below; see?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, compared with some of the other things that are said about us, that is mild. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCARTNEY. You don't know the half of it. [Laughter.]

Like Mr. Pace testified this morning, they are set in the different categories for the simple reason that they are better in this position than they are in that one, and much cleverer. For instance, in the case of Barney Crump, the strategy that he uses is so much different from the strategy that this Rower uses—so much different—that they can detect just who is the best man to send after you, if you are a militant and they think you would make a good Communist Party member, to find out some of your qualifications; and they would pick this bird to go after you, and he would be assigned to get you into the party. That is the way it is worked in the plant. They assign certain individuals to go after other individuals. At first it is all talked over in their meetings, and if you are probably a golf player, or something like that, and this fellow is a golf player, and also more or less conservative, too, they will say, "Take Jim Jones over there; that is your man."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything you want to add about this, Mr. Rower, or have you completed your statement about him.

Mr. McCARTNEY. There is just one thing I would like to bring out at this time; that this Mr. Rower is a candidate for an executive board office of the local union that was left vacant through one of the boys resigning. That is a trustee position; and he, along with three other Communists that I know of, are candidates for that position on the executive board of trustees. That election is coming up this Sunday.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not get the distinction between that job and the job Rower now holds.

Mr. McCARTNEY. That job would put him on the executive board and put another Communist member on the U. A. W. A., Local 51, executive board. He is only a district committeeman and not a member of the executive board.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, he is seeking promotion?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe you told us about Mr. Hooley.

Mr. McCARTNEY. To a certain extent.

The CHAIRMAN. Give us some more about Mr. Hooley.

Mr. McCARTNEY. Hooley's wife, as I stated before, is a member also of the Communist Party. His position is to distribute the Midwest Daily Record both at the plant and in the union; that is, at the steward membership meetings.

Hooley now is a past district committeeman of district No. 14.

Hooley was fired from the Plymouth plant for refusal to work, calling the plant manager, or a superintendent in the plant, a G—— d—— liar.

He was a type of a fellow who thought—he was a steward and he was not going to work, and they fired him.

I believe I had better bring out—I was chairman of the shop committee at that time, and I was forced to take up his case. Of course, I was aware fully of him being a member of the Communist Party. My opinion was he was a member then, but I did not know for sure. I was forced to take up his case with the labor relations man at the Plymouth plant.

This fellow, Hooley, at the present time, is working with unemployment compensation in Detroit, and the position he got was supposed to be a temporary job.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a Federal or State position?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is State. What he is doing now is going around and helping a man by the name of Millstone, who now is at the convention in Pittsburgh, organize the municipal, State, and county employees into a union; that is, a workers' union. That is what he is doing at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he on the pay roll of the State government?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. To organize the State government employees?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not his function, is it?

Mr. McCARTNEY. No; his position—he is working with the unemployment compensation, but, of course, in the evenings he attends these meetings and contacts these people to join.

The CHAIRMAN. What is Millstone's first name; do you know?

Mr. McCARTNEY. No; I do not know. I was introduced to him, but I do not know his first name.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know a man by the name of H. Cook?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us about him; what his position is in the union and in the Communist Party.

Mr. McCARTNEY. Before I go any further, one more thing I would like to say. I am bringing out these things, but I want you to give me a little time because I want to state my position thoroughly.

First, I try to be an active union man and am very sincerely in the union movement; I want to see it succeed.

Some of the testimony I will bring out may, in some respects, be a detriment to the organization, but I want it to be known now, if it is put in the press, it should be given in such a way that it is not going to hurt this organization, and that it is going to be put on the shoulders of the Communist Party, because they are the people who really fostered most of our trouble in the Plymouth plant.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is thoroughly understood.

Mr. McCARTNEY. This fellow Cook is a district committeeman on the second shift of district No. 14. He works in the gas-tank department.

I will try to make this story as brief as possible.

The production of the gas-tank department is 1,480 gas tanks in 8 hours, which is 185 an hour.

On the 1937 model the union was recognized and we got along fine, and the production of the gas tanks was coming fine—he is in the gas-tank department—the production in that department was coming fine.

They had 56 men for that production and they would get out 1,480 gas tanks a day.

It so happened, when these fellows came back to work on the 1938 model in this department, they started to produce 1,150 gas tanks, 1,200 and 1,225. This went on for approximately 10 days.

The management in this particular instance was very lenient. There was leniency through the respect that the men were just coming back to work and could not just get into their jobs.

After 10 days, the management called me in—I was chairman of the shop committee—and related what they were going to do if these fellows did not bring back production and showed me records where production had been 1,480, and got as high as 1,550 gas tanks out of that department in 8 hours.

So I immediately called in the steward on the first shift. His name was Gustafson, and I told him what the plant manager related to me, that somebody would be fired, after relating the whole story to me, and that was just on the part of the fellows working there and not getting out production.

So I immediately went down to the president, Lamotte, and the financial secretary of the local, Duletsky, and related to them what was taking place. It was at noontime and they told me to go back to the local and tell this fellow to go back to the office and they would straighten him out. I went and told this fellow to go down to the president and financial secretary, that they wanted to talk to him.

He went down, and the very next evening, on the second shift, they got out their production, which was 185 an hour; they got it out 12 minutes before the hour was up and shut the button on the line, and sat down. The next hour they got the production out 10 minutes before the hour was up and shut the button off and shut it down and sat down.

It is such things as that that are hurting the workers in the plant, and it is hurting the union. We people do not want that, and the real people in the union do not want that sort of stuff.

That was the start, and there were conditions where here is a Communist who goes to Communist meetings—

The CHAIRMAN. What fellow are you talking about?

Mr. McCARTNEY. H. Cook.

Mr. MOSIER. He was one of this particular group?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The union cannot designate you as a labor spy, can they?

Mr. McCARTNEY. In this testimony right here, it brings that out, and brings it out to be very bad. So I try to make it clear to you that we fellows do not want that stuff, and the reason why I stated to you first, I am first a good American, a union man, and an American citizen.

Mr. MASON. You say you do not want that stuff.

Mr. McCARTNEY. No.

Mr. MASON. Good union men do not want that stuff, because good union men realize that it is not in the interest of the union, not in the interest of the future of union men, that it does tend to discredit them; is that the reason you do not want that stuff?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is true; that is right. In other words, they are not given an opportunity to give their opinions at a meeting, and as far as going down to a meeting is concerned, when they attempt to express themselves at a meeting they are booed, and told they are out of order, and told to sit down, and so forth and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. Now let us get down to some others. There is Mr. Sam Olshansky; do you know him?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Sam Olshansky works in department 96; he is known as a white-button steward. He is assistant to the district committeeman. He is a book agent and also salesman for Communist literature. He takes a very active part in the local union affairs. He also is publicity agent for local 51.

In the month of December, when I went into the local union office, he had the Daily Worker paper and was taking out an editorial out of that paper, and when I came in he had other papers and covered it up, and I asked him what he was doing. He said he was writing an editorial for the Plymouth Beacon. He was taking it out of the Daily Worker. I got the Daily Worker paper and observed the article he put in there, in the Plymouth Beacon, and it was word for word what he took out of this Daily Worker paper.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Mr. Fred Gabelle?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I am not positive about how you pronounce it. He is also one of the district committeemen, and he has approximately from three to four hundred men under him. He is a member of the Communist Party, also.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about his activities in the plant, whether or not he is very active in carrying on communistic work?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Well, so far as the actions of all these fellows are concerned, their actions are above their union actions. Of course, when they took the oath of allegiance to the Communist Party they swore that everything they do will be for the benefit of the Communist Party, and every move that they make, every move these fellows make, is not for the betterment of the union; it is for the betterment of the party.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the difference between their objective in promoting strife, strikes, and labor disturbances and the objectives of the legitimate trade unionists who go on a strike? What is the difference in the objectives between the two?

Mr. McCARTNEY. It appears to me that these people are taking actions, which they have taken in the past years, attempting to create trouble and dissatisfaction.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they want to improve working conditions?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is not their aim. They do not want satisfaction; they want dissatisfaction, because if we were to improve their working conditions, if they were to help the majority of the people in the plant to improve working conditions, they would be lost in the wind. As long as there is dissatisfaction, discontentment, and turmoil, they have people they can work on, but when there is peace and harmony they do not want peace and harmony, and that has been proven to be so. If we had a lapse of good feeling in the plant, there is bound to be within a week or so something come up right from the old Communist Party to keep her going, to keep her stirred up.

The CHAIRMAN. What you are primarily interested in is an improvement in working conditions?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Improved working conditions and a fair share of the profits which the people whom we work for make.

The CHAIRMAN. If you can accomplish that through peaceful means, would you rather do that than through a strike?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I would much rather do it through peaceful means.

The CHAIRMAN. What I want you to explain is the difference between what the Communists are seeking to do in their labor activities and what the legitimate trade unionsists are trying to do. Is it correct to say that the legitimate trade unionists' only objective is the improvement of working conditions, generally speaking?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Whereas the Communists' objective is to seize upon dissatisfaction and complaints as an excuse for promoting communism and bring about revolution; is not that a fact?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is right; that is their objective.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know a man by the name of John King?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir; John King is district committeeman of the second shift, of district No. 7. That is the motor line.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he a Communist?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He absolutely is a Communist; he collects dues for the Communist Party of the Plymouth unit.

As a matter of fact, I have an affidavit from one of the boys who is a district committeeman, a very conservative man, and a very good union man, by the name of Don Wilson, and in a general membership meeting in December, as King got a little reckless and left some of his material on the desk in the back of the union hall, Don Wilson picked up his book, which was a Communist dues book and personal property, signed by John King. He is a district committeeman and a dues collector.

Going further on that, when we renewed our contract with the Chrysler Corporation in April 1938, the corporation came through with a little change after the contract had been signed and ratified by the men, they came through with a little change regarding procedure or the district committeeman taking up a grievance.

Of course, the Communist Party had a meeting just about this time, just after this new change came about. They decided—we were

going along pretty peacefully, and production was going along pretty good, so they decided that if this change was going in there, making this change, they were not going to accept it.

So this King came in, and he was off his job, quit his job at the start of the second shift, and the foreman told him to go back on his job, and he refused to do that, and told him why he was off his job. Of course, I expect he had reasons of his own, and they immediately fired him, and the motor line shut down, they stopped the line.

That one instance, in my opinion, was just—this turmoil was just fostered by this Communist group to cause contention, and he was one of the fellows fired, and the very next night the fellow he put in charge of the district was also fired, and the plant protection had to pick him up by the feet: he put up quite a fuss, and they carried him out of the plant. However, they are both back working now.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know a man by the name of Lindouf?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his first name?

Mr. McCARTNEY. C. Lindouf is his name. He is the chief committeeman on district No. 3, and he has a connection there with the Midwest Daily Record. He has some position that he holds there as salesman, or something like that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he a Communist?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, he is a member of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you anything to say about his activities?

Mr. McCARTNEY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. What about Tom Metz?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I do not know an awful lot about Tom Metz, except that he does attend Communist meetings and takes part in their functions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he a member of the union?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He is a member of the union and also a steward. He is a white-button man and assistant to the chief district committeeman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the position of steward an important position in the plant?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes; a steward is an important position through the respect that they are given charge of so many men, collecting dues and giving advice, and so forth. In a position of giving advice, naturally being a member of the Communist Party, they would only give them advice that would be of benefit to the Communist cause.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Mr. Tony Gobble?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir; Tony Gobble is also a member of the Communist Party. He is a salesman for the Midwest Daily Record. He sells papers occasionally out in front of the plant and at membership meetings he stands outside of the door and sometimes inside and sells these papers.

The CHAIRMAN. What position does he hold in the union?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He is a white-button steward.

The CHAIRMAN. What about Mr. Robert Gamble?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Robert Gamble attends Communist meetings and takes part in all their functions.

The CHAIRMAN. What position does he hold in the union?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He is a white-button steward.

The CHAIRMAN. What about Mr. Glenn Wingate?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He is a chief district committeeman of district No. 1 of Local 51.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the U. A. W.?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes, sir. All these people I am mentioning now are members of the local that work in the plant.

The CHAIRMAN. He holds a pretty responsible place in the union?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He has approximately 400 men under him.

The CHAIRMAN. He is active like the rest of them?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Very active.

The CHAIRMAN. For the Communists. What about Mr. Mike Rodneck? Do you know him?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes. Mike Rodneck is also a chief district committeeman, a member of the Communist Party. The district he is over is district No. 11. He is very active. As a matter of fact, he is on several committees.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe you had concluded your statement about Mike Rodnick. Do you know a man by the name of John Peterie?

Mr. McCARTNEY. John Peterie; he is known as a white-button steward, and also a member of the union.

The CHAIRMAN. He is a member of what?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He is a member of the union and a member of the Communist Party. As a matter of fact, his father is a member of the Communist Party. His father works in the Packard Motor Car Co. plant and his brother and sister work in the Plymouth plant. I have never been able to locate them, but they are reputed as members of the Communist Party also.

The CHAIRMAN. In your own investigation as a union man, have you ever carried on any of this investigating work for the company itself?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Oh, never; no, sir; my God! No.

The CHAIRMAN. I wanted to clear that up, because usually an effort is made to create the impression that those who testify about communism are labor spies.

Mr. McCARTNEY. Mr. Dies, to make that just a little clearer, personally I would not stoop to such a thing, to spy on the working class of people. As a matter of fact, I have got six brothers that toil with their hands. When I do that, I am working against them. I never would do a thing like that.

I am testifying here in behalf of just good American unionism. That is what I want. And I want you people to do everything possible to help clear this thing up, to get these birds out of these unions, because we want a union.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wallace Christie; I believe you said something about him, did you not?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What position does he hold in the union?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Wallace Christie is a member of the Communist Party. He worked in the Plymouth plant just prior to the union coming into the plant; that is, the recognition of the union by the Chrysler management. Christie was fired for radical activities, but

in the following month he was elected at the yearly local election of officers to the position of guide and member of the executive board.

The CHAIRMAN. What is he now?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He holds no position in the local union, but 6 months after he was elected, at one of the executive board meetings, I made the request, in view of the fact that he was not a worker in the plant and was working in another plant and held a union official position there, so that he could not devote his time properly to his activities in the union here—I asked that he resign. I put it before the executive board and stated my reasons and the motion was passed.

It so happened that at the very next executive board meeting of the local, that we had—that was in the month of July 1937—Brother Christie was there, Johnny on the spot. When I asked that he be removed, they stated they did not think it would be a proper thing to have him put off the executive board at that time, although the motion had passed the executive board.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Paul Benyo, you already testified about him. Do you have anything to add about him? What position does he have with the union?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Paul Benyo was elected at the last yearly election of the local officers, which was held in February, to the position of guide. Paul Benyo joined the Communist Party, as I stated before, in March of 1937. Then he found out what it was all about and dropped it like a hot potato.

The CHAIRMAN. What is a guide?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is an assistant to the president, sort of, you might say, an office boy.

The CHAIRMAN. Assistant to the president of the local?

Mr. McCARTNEY. In other words, a sort of a——

Mr. MASON. An errand boy?

Mr. McCARTNEY. An errand boy, that is about all it is. But he also has a voice on the executive board.

The CHAIRMAN. But it gives him a wide contact with the workers, does it not?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Very wide; as a matter of fact, it gives him a vote and a voice on the executive board, too, which carries a lot of weight.

The CHAIRMAN. So with respect to the various positions that the Communists seek, they are always strategic positions; is that true?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. They want positions that will put them in constant contact with the workers?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And also positions that will aid them in case of a strike; is that right?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That is right; in other words, where they will be in a position to dominate and dictate to other people. These people are hoodwinked; they do not quite understand the whole situation; they do not understand the Communist movement, and they are given

the old fireball, and these fellows are hoodwinked. They throw them; and the Communists, of course, are then out of the picture.

The CHAIRMAN. What has been your observation as to their ability to call an unauthorized strike? Have you had many unauthorized strikes at the Plymouth plant?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I could not say exactly, but we have had about three or four unauthorized strikes at the plant. Of course, to relate that story, I might say that there is a friction in the U. A. W. that is well known; there is the conservative group which is headed by Homer Martin and the one which is headed by the Communist group known as the Unity.

At the time of the convention in Milwaukee, I was a delegate to that convention. Even then I was not aware of just what was taking place and who all these people were.

At that time I was chairman of the shop committee. I was elected then as a delegate to this convention. So, when I got down to this convention, I observed all of these different things that were taking place. It really opened up my eyes, especially the people who attended these meetings who had no business being there; Maurice Sugar and this fellow I. W. Ruskin, and this Mrs. Zook from Hamtramck were on the council there. And after all of these sessions, they all got their heads together and certain officials of the U. A. W. that were of this unity group were up there with them in caucuses. Well, I observed these things and started to investigate. That is really when I started to investigate and find out what this was all about.

By that time my mind was really set in good straight union principles. I was fighting for better conditions for the men. I was not paying any attention to this other stuff.

Immediately after that, when I started to bring out these facts in the local union, especially in membership meetings, "these people here are not doing the right thing because they bring in resolutions from Communist meetings"—and I knew who was going to present the resolution and who was going to second it and who was going to talk on it. I pointed out certain individuals there, "This fellow is going to talk on so-and-so and you are going to second it and you are supposed to put the motion on the floor," and so forth. Well, from then on they labeled me as a "red" baiter and as a stool pigeon and a company union man and a Coughlinite. They called me so many different things I did not know how I could be everything.

Of course, I ran for president of the local union also. I ran against this Leo Lamont. They got me down in a little 2 by 4 room inside of the plant and wanted to know what I thought about the Communist Party. So I thought I would lead them on a little bit, and I says, "Well, now, so far as the Communist Party is concerned, some of their principles are all right, but some of their principles are just all wrong, for the simple reason that, in general, when you go against the law of God and also against the law of Nature I do not know where you are going to end up."

However, what they wanted of me was this: They knew of my militancy, which I admit—I was very militant; I fought for the workers—they wanted to back me in this run for president. They

did not want Lamont because he was at that time a little bit conservative. However, because of my getting up and stating who these Communists were and pointing them out to the people, bringing them out in the open too much, they started to condemn me, and they put out pamphlets in the meeting. These pamphlets were printed in the Communist Hall on Fourteenth Street in Detroit. I do not know the actual number, but it is the Communist Hall on Fourteenth Street, and they passed them out to the workers at the gate, saying that Pat McCartney was a well-known stooge for Father Coughlin and he was anti-C. I. O., and he was a "red" baiter and, my Lord, what else. This copy was turned over to the C. I. O. committee, was put in Homer Martin's hands. Of course, I was defeated at the election.

Now, at that time I imagine that there were close to 7,000 people in good standing to vote. Just prior to this time, when we had our vote at the hall, I asked that the vote be taken by a ballot sent through the mail, and the return ballot be sent to a post-office-box number. We had a majority of the men in the plant for it. I was not very much afraid then, but I was ruled out and it was voted down.

It so happened that at the meeting for the nomination of officers, for people to run for these offices, we had six fellows on the pay roll and all of the six had been fired from the plant. This Hooley was one of them, and another one was this Toner—he was an active member of the Communist Party then. He was going around telling people that I never belonged to the union at a certain time and I was too thick with the bosses, and stuff like that.

You know, that is one of the very strategic points, if they see you talking to a boss of the plant and you happen to smile, they say, "Oh, he is selling us out." That is, they say that to the man next to him, and it gets down the line that Pat McCartney is selling them out, which was not true. I was just trying to create a little good feeling there.

However, that is one of the things that takes place. Now, at this meeting, we had a bunch of good boys there and we knew what was coming up, but we were not educated in this organizational work as well as they were. We had just about as many fellows as they did, but they really know their stuff when it comes down to organizational work. We got on the floor regarding the election of the ballot committee. Well, that was the most important part. We stated that we would rule these people out because they were on the pay roll and we would give somebody else the job that was not working.

They said, "Oh, no, no, no; that is too much expense on the local pay roll." These fellows at the time, I think were getting around \$20 or \$30 a week. There were three that I know were absolute Communists, out of the six; Gabelley, Toner, and Hooley. I knew that, and I was skeptical of a fourth one.

So finally they were able to push this thing across. That was the election committee. Now, they tried to get this thing done at a time that was naturally the worst time. That is, Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, when the workers came out of the plant on a Monday night, these communists got up in there and they packed the hall and they packed the stairway and out onto the street.

Now, after work, these fellows are tired and hungry and they would look at this and they would say, "There are too many in there, I am going to go home," and it really turned hundreds of people away. They would drive by in a car, four or five of them, and they would say, "I can't wait there." But in reality there were not many voting. It was just the people that were standing there.

After the people got into the rooms, to show you the strategy that they use, after they finally got up, they would put them into one room, and then they would take them out of there and move them into another room, and then move them back again, and when the time came to count the ballots—I had already been down to the international office and asked for help, because I stated who these people were, and I knew darned well that there would be something underhanded about it. So they finally sent up a couple of fellows, and they were there at the time of the election. But I do not think they were educated to these things, as to just how these fellows were maneuvering.

So when the time came to count the ballots, there were fourteen hundred and some votes. Now, they had an eligibility list of close to 600 people. They had a book, you see; Jim Jones, he was eligible, and all of these fellows that voted. The people came in there and their names were not on the list. So they sent them up into the office, one flight up, to Mike Duletsky. He had charge of the records upstairs. So Mike, he gives them an O. K. They talk in some foreign language to Mike and he talks in a foreign language to them and Mike gives them a slip, "O. K."

After the ballots were counted, we had 500 of these O. K. slips of Mike Duletsky's.

I had a fellow by the name of Pat O'Mara who stayed there all night counting these ballots. And when they were counting the ballots, they would say, "One for Leo Lamont; one for Pat McCartney; one for Leo Lamont; one for Leo Lamont," and so on. Of course, this one fellow here could not keep up with those birds.

So when these officers, the international officers, took these white slips up there, Mike Duletsky looked them over and in five minutes O. K.'d all of them, O. K.'d the names without even looking at the record. He took the slips and O. K.'d them all.

And when these fellows went downstairs to get the ballot box, lo and behold, it was gone. They were going to take it to the international office.

So that is how the election ended up at the Plymouth local. However, we had an election of district committeemen, 24 districts. I was finally elected as a district committeeman in the maintenance district.

Now, just prior to this they had met, this Communist group, and I was getting this information, not from one but from two people. I talked to one and then I talked to the other, and the other one told me the same thing, so I knew it was a fact.

Their main objective was to get me right out, to get me out entirely to see that I was not elected. They were going to do everything in their power. However, I was elected, and the next thing they were going to do was to do everything in their power to get rid of me, to get me thrown out.

So at one of the district committeemen's meetings they were all grouped around at a regular monthly meeting, and something came up

relative to this factionalism in the U. A. W., and I brought up certain statements, and brought up one that I had heard against Leo Lamont, the president.

I told them I had heard it and wanted to know whether it was true or not, and, lo and behold, he brings charges against me, and all I did was to ask him a question.

You see, they were doing their best to get rid of me, and I had not pulled any punches. People asked me what so-and-so was, and I would say that he is a Communist, or, if he is all right, he seems to be doing the right thing.

Finally they put me on trial and found me guilty, the trial board members. The trial board members, they were all elected by these fellows and it was all out and dried.

It was relative to a statement that was made by one of John L. Lewis' chief lieutenants when he was in Detroit talking to a group of people. Most of the executive board of the U. A. W. were there.

I appealed my case to the international executive board, and went before the board and explained my side of the story. Almost two-thirds of the executive board were there and heard the statements made, and so I was cleared.

Then the first thing they did—you see, I was also a member of the Detroit district council and this Nat Ganley and John Anderson took a very, very active part—

The CHAIRMAN. They are both Communists, are they not?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes; they are just out-and-out Communists. They even admit that. This Ganley put a motion on the floor to finance the money to bring these fellows back, this Abraham Lincoln Brigade, bring them back to this country. They had sent them over to Spain. These boys picked them up and had them all fixed up and financed their way over to Spain. They wanted the U. A. W. to finance it out of their own money, to bring those boys back.

Well, I objected to it and talked on it and voted against it. There were several other motions came up relative to that, that I thought was a help to the Communist Party, and I voted against them and gave my reasons.

At the next meeting they had me recalled as a delegate to the Detroit district council. However, in the meantime this factional strife was going on in the union. I started to call a lot of the boys in the plant, and call them over to another union hall, the union district hall, I think somewhere in the neighborhood of three to five hundred people, and I explained the situation to these people, just what it was all about, and had representatives from the international office come up and tell about the election, and so forth and so on, and why these officers were expelled from the international executive board, and that they were rightfully expelled, that Homer Martin did the right thing. Well, lo and behold, I was recalled from my job as district committeeman, on the recommendation of the president, Leo Lamont, and these fellows got up on the floor and they called me everything, and when I got up on the floor in my own defense, I was just ready to say one word and I was booed down. These fellows started it, and the other poor people, they did not understand what it was all about—these Communists, they started, just as Mr. Pace stated this morning, it just takes a few and the other

people get confused and they boo too; whatever the others are doing, they do.

However, I left before the meeting was over for the simple reason that I went to the back of the hall and people were coming down and pointing at me and a crowd started to gather, and I decided I had better leave.

I have not been back to a local meeting since then, but I do intend to go, even after this. I do intend to go to local union meetings. Of course, they had me recalled then.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we have covered the situation. Are those all the names that you have?

Mr. McCARTNEY. There are a couple of other things I would like to say here, too; that the Communists also stated at their meetings that they were going to hold meetings right in the hall as soon as the Plymouth local moved. At the time this statement was made our local hall was on Strong Avenue in Detroit. They made the statement that they were going to hold their Communist meetings right in the hall.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that statement made and who made it?

Mr. McCARTNEY. That was made at a Communist meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know about the date that the statement was made?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I judge it was sometime in April 1938.

There is another one here that I wanted to read off, also at these Communist meetings, where it was stated time and time again. Here is one statement that was made at Communist meetings, that their only aim was to get control of the United Automobile Workers union so that they would have a mass party here in Detroit. This was during the election of local officers at Plymouth, that after this election them said they would have control of the offices in the Plymouth local; the Communist Party would have control.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think they are in control of that union?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Oh, they are; without doubt. They could put a motion on the floor right now to vote the finances to bring Browder or Foster up to talk, and it would pass.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean that this local there with 10,000 members is under the control of those Communists?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes; I do, Mr. Dies, for this reason. The good people that have attended these meetings have become so discouraged by the action of these Communists in prolonging any discussion about any action that would be of any benefit to the workers—that is, a motion or a resolution would be put on the floor looking to the benefit of the workers, and these people would get up and talk against it so long, and prolong the meeting, these people would get so discouraged, the good people, that they would leave the meeting.

At one time we had three to four thousand people, when the union was first recognized by the corporation—we had around three or four thousand people attending all our meetings. That dwindled down so that at the time that they passed a recommendation and found me guilty, this trial board, there were only 99 people there.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the average number now who attend the meetings?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Right at the present time, I judge there are close to 250 to 300 people. It jumps anywhere from 100 to 300 people now.

The CHAIRMAN. Out of 10,000?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Out of 10,000. The only time there are more than that is when some big issue comes up, like what you have probably read quite a bit about on this 32-hour question. I imagine there were close to 2,500 people at that meeting that time; that was started in the Plymouth plant, this 32-hour question.

The CHAIRMAN. What is true with reference to the other locals, so far as Communist control is concerned?

Mr. McCARTNEY. It works the same in the other locals as it has in ours.

In other words, we take, for instance, the Murray Body local. I could not say positively, but this fellow will admit that he is a Communist, this fellow Lloyd Jones, who is the president of that local.

Of course, on the other hand, we will take the Packard local, those fellows just went right to the front and beat the living hell out of these boys, and they shoved them right out of these positions. They fought them out, and at the present time the Packard local is in pretty good hands. These fellows are really sincere, and they have got the Communists there under pretty good control. They have a fellow there by the name of Kurt Murdock who has been in the labor movement for quite some time.

The CHAIRMAN. Of what local is Lloyd Jones president?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Murray Body, No. 2.

The CHAIRMAN. About how many members do they have?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I could not answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they a large membership?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes; they have quite a large membership.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say that that local is under the control of the Communists?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Yes; positively. There was one meeting where the boys went to the meeting and were carrying clubs. They had several sergeants at arms, at this meeting, and they were carrying clubs about that long [illustrating].

Now, I just want to make another statement regarding the Packard local. I was asked to go over there to give a talk one night at one of the caucuses that the good fellows had at the Packard local, and there were pretty close to 40 district committeemen and stewards there. When I got through talking, one fellow raised up his hand and started to bring out something about communism, and they started questioning him a little bit, and he says, "Brother, you can't tell me anything about communism, because I was a big member at one time." His name is Clark. He started to relate how he happened to become a member of the Communist Party, and it was very interesting.

In 1931 things were pretty bad. There was the depression. The plant that he was working in was the Hupmobile Motor Car Co. A couple of fellows went to him and told him—a couple of Communists—they said, "Now, Clark, if you go downtown in this May Day demonstration and beat the hell out of a policeman, we will give you a quart of whisky."

Clark said that he would do anything for a quart of whisky, so Clark proceeds to go downtown, and when he is in Cadillac Square he does not see just how he is going to make his kill. So eventually he gets out in the middle of the street, and a cop comes by on horseback, using a club, to shove them back to the sidewalk. Clark calls him a few names, and tries to take a punch at him, this cop on a horse, and he did happen to hit this mounted policeman. Finally there were a swarm of them around, and they just beat the living hell out of him and had him taken to jail.

So, lo and behold, he was in there a day, when who comes in but Morris Sugar, and Morris gets him out of jail. He gets him out of jail, and tells him to come over to his office. So Clark goes to Sugar's office. He asks for a cigarette, and he says, "Here is one." He gives him a cigarette, with a \$5 bill, talking communism between. Then Clark says that he joined the Communist Party. He said, "I am a full-fledged Communist." They took Clark and put him in a district, or in charge of a district. They put him down there collecting money in Detroit. It so happened that he did not see any reason why he should turn this money over to the Communist Party, so he kept it. Accordingly, they brought him before the trial board and found him guilty. He said that was his experience in the Communist Party. Sugar gave him \$5.

The CHAIRMAN. With reference to some of the other locals, what do you have to say? You have named the Packard local, the Murray Body local, and the Plymouth. Can you tell us something with reference to the other locals, with regard to Communist control?

Mr. McCARTNEY. No doubt you have followed up the movement of the U. A. W. A. during this factional fight. You will recall that at the time the president of the Chrysler local, whose name is Marshall, came to Washington to see John L. Lewis, he made the statement to John L. Lewis that he wanted to see peace and harmony.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you know he made that statement?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I was not present but, as a matter of fact, I was told this by P. J. Thomas, who was with him. He is a vice president of the U. A. W. A., and it comes from a very good source. I know that Thomas is a very truthful man. He made the statement to him that he was not in favor of John L. Lewis going down there and taking control and putting an administrator in the U. A. W. A. They had been threatened by a man who was a known Communist, the president of the Chrysler Local No. 7. He had been threatened that if he did, he would suffer the consequences, and that he would also sabotage the local to the extent that he would be put out as president of the local. By taking it on that scale, I would say that at least half of the locals in the U. A. W. A. are in the same category as the Plymouth local. They have the same Communist unit in each one, and they use the same system of going about things. They have their grapevine systems to spread their propaganda. In other words a pamphlet put out at the Plymouth plant is passed to other plants. The pamphlet on the Dies committee was passed to the other plants, or to all the plants in Detroit.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not found that pamphlet yet?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I had it over here in the restaurant.

The CHAIRMAN. You can find it later. There is another question: Did your organization ever donate anything to the Communist cause?

Mr. McCARTNEY. The organization is a member of the Civil Rights Committee. They are a part of the Communist group in the unions, and they were instrumental in getting out people into the Civil Rights Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that committee?

Mr. McCARTNEY. The Civil Rights Committee is supposed to be one of the side arms of the Communist Party, like the Workers Alliance, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. Did your organization donate any money to them?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I was a member of the executive board at one time, and I know they loaned the Civil Rights Committee \$100. I know that at one time they loaned the Civil Rights Committee \$100, but whether it was paid back, or not, I do not know. On two occasions they brought up the question of auditing the books. They wanted to get rid of me on that account. They did not want the books audited. There were two occasions, and one was a TB sanatorium somewhere in California. They had some tickets on sale there for some occasion in connection with the TB sanatorium. The TB Sanatorium is talked about in Communist meetings, and it is an out-and-out Communist organization. On two other occasions they donated money. They donated money for democracy in Spain. On one of the occasions they donated, I think, \$50 for an ambulance. I do not know whether that money got over there or not.

There is one other thing I want to bring out regarding the U. A. W. A. executive board. I had occasion twice to be on the committee to take our grievances down before the international, to be taken up through the procedure set aside or provided for in the contract between the unions and the Chrysler management. When we took the grievances down there, they could not go into them. Martin was away, and the only man we could get hold of was Windom Mortimer.

The CHAIRMAN. What was his position?

Mr. McCARTNEY. Vice president, on the executive board. I do not think we had been in the place more than 10 minutes explaining the grievances—we had not gotten through with one-tenth of them—when he stopped and said, “Fellows, there is only one thing to meet the situation, and that is to sit down and go on strike.” Right then and there, I thought it was particularly bad, he being an international officer, and being paid a high salary, to say that, instead of following the procedure set up in the contract. We were taking the grievances to him, and he, under the contract, was to go to the Chrysler officials. He said, “The only way to get satisfaction is to sit down.”

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether or not Mortimer was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. McCARTNEY. I do not know. I know that he is very much in favor of the Communist group. He has Ed Hall and Morris Sugar. At any time they want an attorney they go to Morris Sugar, and as negotiator they want Ed Hall.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether or not Mortimer has an alias?

Mr. McCARTNEY. He goes by the name of George Baker, or Comrade Baker.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. McCARTNEY. There is one other statement: Right after these elections, three fellows were recalled as district committeemen—two

others besides myself—at the same time I was recalled, at the recommendation of Leo Lamont, president of the local. The same people and myself attended a dance, or a union dance, right after the elections, and when we came down out of doors, or down the stairs into the hall, we were pounced upon by a bunch of those fellows. It so happened that personally I had made no remarks about the Communists at this dance, but one fellow who had made a remark about the Communists got beat up to such an extent that this fellow was taken to the hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you for your testimony. Mr. Pace wishes to make a short statement in defense of Governor Murphy.

ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY OF JOHN T. PACE

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, before I start, let me say we were looking at that pamphlet, and I wanted to refer to it. It was a pamphlet exposing the Dies committee to criticism as to the type of witnesses that testified at that time, such as Jake Spolansky, Mikuliak, and Meciesek, and people from the Detroit Police Department, as to subversive activities. That was what ruffled us.

The CHAIRMAN. You wanted to make an additional statement.

Mr. PACE. In the Communist activities they have situations in strike developments where something serious happens, where the law-enforcing agencies arrest the leaderships and destroy their equipment, and when they do that, they drive the party underground. In the process of preparing for strikes, the Communist Party is also preparing for this emergency. That was brought out here by Pat awhile ago—that is, while these Communists are making preparations for elections, and other things, the sincere elements in the unions, not knowing what to do, are not making any preparations to offset it.

The Communists, when somebody is preparing an attack on them, are making preparations for that attack. They envision the attack ahead of time, but they do not put their entire leadership into the situation. I might state that I was for a year and a half a member of the district bureau of the Communist Party in Michigan, and I had occasion to direct some of those activities in the Ford hunger march. They had organized the Ford hunger march, and when those four people were killed, the party was driven immediately underground. We did not want to be driven underground, and so we went underground ourselves. We grouped the district leadership, and while we put one in charge of the Ford hunger march, there was another group held under cover to carry on those activities if necessary, whatever happened, depending on the situation. Well, immediately after the hunger march raids were made, when meetings were raided, typewriters, mimeographs, and so forth, were destroyed, but still we were able in the city of Detroit to put out 500,000 pieces of literature within 12 hours. That is, they have as much equipment and as much of conveniences underground, for the underground activities, as they have in the open.

Mr. MOSIER. That is held in reserve?

Mr. PACE. They have a reserve for every occasion. Now, it is important to know just how this information service is carried on underground. The only way it can be done is by detailing certain people for certain activities. They will have a certain sign on certain houses. Nobody but certain members of the Communist Party

knows what it means. It may be a warped shingle, or a cracked windowpane, and then it is only known to them as a meeting place, or, rather, a contact point. They have those signs in various parts of the city, and when they are maneuvering around, they are watching for some sign, and when they see it is a contact point, they go in there and get instructions where else to go. They have a whole network of it. They know where the place is from the sign. They know by the sign that it is a contact point, and they know where to go to get instructions. Within a period of 2 or 3 days, we were able to organize the parade down Woodward Avenue, with approximately 70,000 people. Then 2 months after that, the Young Communist League in Detroit grew from around 350 members to 1,100 members, and the Communist Party grew from around 750 members to around 1,900 members. Now, I am bringing this out for the purpose of showing those methods that they use, and that they are not correct methods to use.

Now, if Mr. Harry Bennett, the personnel director of the Ford Motor Co., when this march approached the factory, had taken the committee in, welcomed them with open arms, and had taken them into the office, telling them how many thousands of men the Ford Motor Co. had on its pay rolls, because of the unemployment situation, telling them what they were trying to do to help out, the result would be that the committee would go back and make a lot of big speeches, calling the Ford Motor Co. and the Government all kinds of names, the parade would disband and that would be the end of the Ford hunger march. But that is not what the Communist Party wants. Immediately after that, every Communist unit in the United States was notified of the action, and radical and destructive action was taken. Within a period of 2 days, if you remember the press reports, at some plants in the East and at places in the Middle West, the window glass in practically all Ford service stations was smashed, and at the assembly plants in foreign countries, damage was done by Communist factions in those plants in Europe. That was the result of the way in which the Ford hunger march was handled.

The CHAIRMAN. Your opinion is that it was not handled by the right people.

Mr. PACE. No, sir; in my opinion it should be handled right. That is my opinion, and it is based upon my knowledge. When I was in the leadership of the Communist Party in Michigan I knew what we were satisfied with and what we were not satisfied with. I heard discussions carried on by the leadership of the Communist Party.

Now, I wish to state and, perhaps, stress, in defending my own position with regard to the Flint situation, that, in my opinion, the Flint strike was handled by the Government 100 percent correct after it reached the stage it did. I do not want to be misunderstood there. I say at the stage it reached, and the stage it reached could have been prevented, but the methods used afterward, I think, stopped a national and international calamity. In my opinion they saved, not 8 or 10 killed but it might have run into the hundreds. The Communists were egging it on to create a bad situation at Flint. If force had been used it would have been playing into the Communists' hands. Where the mistake was made was this: When the U. A. W. A. began to grow as it did, and the C. I. O. began to grow into a big mass

movement, Government officials should have gone to the unions and said, "Boys, your Government is 100 percent back of you. We are in favor of organized labor, and we want you to have the right to bargain collectively through labor unions."

They would know that instead of having these Communist subversive influences in the unions, they would be dealing with unions that were responsible, representing the workers on these questions. That would have been the effective way of handling it. If that had been done it could have been handled in the right way. I think that will have to be done now. I want to point out for the benefit of the committee and for the benefit of Pat McCartney, who was an outstanding man in this struggle, that if they will adopt the policy of taking in these people—not trying to get 500 at once—but in groups of 10 or 20, there would be less danger of the union falling into the hands of the Communists. When it does, what happens to the union? They will lose their confidence in the Government, any they are exposed to such influences as the unions were carrying on. Something must be done. He should begin to build around himself the American element, people who believe in American principles. He should build around himself a group, starting with 8, 10, 20, or 30, and then in a short time he will have an organization that will vote the Communists out of the picture. It must be done at some time.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. PACE. I want to make another statement to the committee: I understood you to say, Mr. Chairman, that you are starting on December 1 to take testimony on the subject on how to rehabilitate the American people, and to receive opinions on the way to remove these subversive movements. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. PACE. I also want to testify before this committee during that time. I would take it upon myself to produce a mass of clippings of Communist propaganda and Communist literature. I keep a file of the publicity on both sides, and will be prepared at that time to give the committee some constructive ideas as to how to stop it.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much for your testimony.

(Thereupon, the subcommittee adjourned to meet at the call of the Chair.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1938

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Harold G. Mosier, presiding.

Mr. MOSIER. The committee will come to order. We will hear first this morning Mr. Eagar, of Detroit.

TESTIMONY OF RICHARD EAGAR, DETROIT, MICH.

(The witness was sworn by Mr. Mosier.)

Mr. MOSIER. What is your name?

Mr. EAGAR. Richard Eagar.

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. Eagar, where do you live?

Mr. EAGAR. 14300 Patton Avenue, Detroit.

Mr. MOSIER. Are you married, Mr. Eagar?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Have you any children?

Mr. EAGAR. Three, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. How old?

Mr. EAGAR. Twelve, ten, and four.

Mr. MOSIER. How long have you lived in Detroit?

Mr. EAGAR. I have lived in Detroit since January 1926.

Mr. MOSIER. Where did you come from, to Detroit, Mr. Eagar?

Mr. EAGAR. I came from Windsor, Ontario, Canada.

Mr. MOSIER. Where did you come from, to Windsor, Ontario?

Mr. EAGAR. I was born and raised in Ireland.

Mr. MOSIER. You came from Ireland to Windsor?

Mr. EAGAR. To Canada.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you work in Windsor?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. MOSIER. Then you came from Windsor over to Detroit?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Where you have been since 1926?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir; living in the city of Detroit.

Mr. MOSIER. You are a naturalized American citizen?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Where do you work, Mr. Eagar, in Detroit?

Mr. EAGAR. I work for the Ternstedt manufacturing division of the General Motors.

Mr. MOSIER. The Ternstedt manufacturing division of General Motors?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Where is that Ternstedt division located?

Mr. EAGAR. Their headquarters is in Fort Street, Detroit.

Mr. MOSIER. What part of the automobile does the Ternstedt division of General Motors manufacture?

Mr. EAGAR. Automobile hardware.

Mr. MOSIER. By that you mean everything that goes into——

Mr. EAGAR. The hardware of the car, like the door handles, and so forth.

Mr. MOSIER. The door handles?

Mr. EAGAR. All the hardware.

Mr. MOSIER. All the hardware that goes on the automobile.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. How many people are employed in the Ternstedt division of General Motors?

Mr. EAGAR. When the season is going full, it is between ten and twelve thousand people.

Mr. MOSIER. What is your occupation in that division of General Motors: what do you do?

Mr. EAGAR. I am a diecast operator.

Mr. MOSIER. Have you always been engaged in that occupation, as a diecast operator?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You have a union in the Ternstedt division of General Motors, a labor union?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What is that union?

Mr. EAGAR. U. A. W.

Mr. MOSIER. A local of the U. A. W.?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What local of the U. A. W. is that?

Mr. EAGAR. Local 174, a west-side local.

Mr. MOSIER. Local 174, a west-side local?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Are there any other plants whose workers are in 174, other than your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir; there is, roughly speaking, between 45 and 50 plants in the west-side local.

Mr. MOSIER. Between 45 and 50 plants?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Including your own?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You are a member of that local, are you?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. That local is affiliated with the U. A. W., which, in turn, is affiliated with the C. I. O.?

Mr. EAGAR. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. How many members are there in Local 174, if you know?

Mr. EAGAR. Roughly speaking, I would say there are about 32,000 members of that local.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know the officers of Local 174?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Who are they?

Mr. EAGAR. Walter Ruether is president of the local; Mike Manning is vice president of the local; Frank Manfred is financial secretary; and Irene Young is recording secretary.

Mr. MOSIER. Walter Ruether is one of the three Ruether brothers, of Detroit, is he not?

Mr. EAGAR. That is right, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. When did you join the U. A. W.?

Mr. EAGAR. In January 1937.

Mr. MOSIER. Had you belonged to any labor union before that time, Mr. Eagar?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What was that?

Mr. EAGAR. I belonged to the Mechanics Educational Society.

Mr. MOSIER. Was that union affiliated with either the American Federation of Labor or the Committee for Industrial Organization?

Mr. EAGAR. No; it was an independent organization, and still is.

Mr. MOSIER. It was independent, and still is?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And still exists?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And has some membership in your plant, does it?

Mr. EAGAR. There is no membership of the Mechanics Educational in our plant now.

Mr. MOSIER. You say that Walter Ruether has in this Local 174 some 30,000 members. How many of those members are in your plant, the Ternstedt division?

Mr. EAGAR. Roughly speaking, about 9,000.

Mr. MOSIER. About 9,000 of those members are in your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Have you been active in any capacity in your plant, in your union?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Have you held any position?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What position or positions, if any, have you held?

Mr. EAGAR. I was plant chairman of the Ternstedt, and chairman of the top or bargaining committee of Ternstedt.

Mr. MOSIER. You were plant chairman at Ternstedt?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes.

Mr. MOSIER. And chairman of the bargaining committee?

Mr. EAGAR. In the Ternstedt plants.

Mr. MOSIER. I want to ask you this question, Mr. Eagar: Is the plant chairman elected; is that an elective office?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Elected by the men in your group?

Mr. EAGAR. The men in the plant.

Mr. MOSIER. The men in your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And is the chairman of the bargaining committee an elective office?

Mr. EAGAR. The man who is plant chairman is automatically chairman of the bargaining committee.

Mr. MOSIER. He is automatically chairman of the bargaining committee, and he conducts the negotiations with the plant management; is that right, on behalf of the men?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What dues do the members of the local pay, or are they required to pay into the union?

Mr. EAGAR. \$1 a month.

Mr. MOSIER. How is that collected?

Mr. EAGAR. It is collected by the shop stewards in the plants, or outside the plants.

Mr. MOSIER. The shop stewards collect the dollar a month?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What happens to that dollar; does it remain in the treasury of your local group, or is a division made of it?

Mr. EAGAR. There is a division made, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Can you explain to the committee what the division is?

Mr. EAGAR. There is 37½ cents that goes to the international union and the balance stays in the local union treasury.

Mr. MOSIER. So the international division of that union gets 37½ cents per man per month?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And the balance stays in your local treasury?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. As chairman of the bargaining committee, and as general chairman of your group, have you had occasion to come in contact with the leaders among the employees of your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know most of them?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir; I do, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you have any members of the Communist Party among the employees in that plant?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Any members of the Socialist Party?

Mr. EAGAR. I do not know of any Socialist Party people in my plant, but there are—

Mr. MOSIER. Ruether himself is a leftist Socialist, is he not?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. MOSIER. He is not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. EAGAR. No, sir; he is not.

Mr. MOSIER. How long were you plant chairman?

Mr. EAGAR. I was plant chairman since its inception until somewhere about last June.

Mr. MOSIER. June of 1938?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Then did you resign or were you removed, or what happened?

Mr. EAGAR. Well, I was removed, more or less by orders of the Communist Party.

Mr. MOSIER. You were removed?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Can you tell the committee why you were removed as plant chairman?

Mr. EAGAR. The reason was because I would not front, or go down the line, for the Communist Party element within my plant.

One of the reasons was that the vice president of our local union was a man from our plant, George Hammond. The Communist Party unit operating within our local felt that he was a dangerous element to their policies as vice president of that local.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you know Mr. Hammond?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir; he worked in the same plant as I did.

Mr. MOSIER. How long have you known Hammond?

Mr. EAGAR. I have known him since the time I joined the U. A. W.; not before then.

Mr. MOSIER. Was Hammond a reputable American citizen?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you have confidence in him?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And these Communists felt that he was not a man whom they could rely on?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What did they want you to do about it?

Mr. EAGAR. They called me into a meeting of their Communist Party unit, and they said he was a dangerous man to their policies within that local; that they could get charges placed against him, provided that I, as plant chairman, would assist in putting them through in my own plant. By that they meant that as chairman of the committee in Ternstedt, if I assisted them, it would have to go to the membership for a vote on these charges that they wanted to bring against Hammond. I told them I would not have anything to do with hanging any charges on any man in the plant; that, if they wished, they could bring it up with the committee of 30 of Ternstedt. We had a committee of 30 people functioning in that plant, and they comprised more or less what we called a "steering committee" of the plant; that they should bring it up before that committee as a whole, and whatever decision they would make I would have to abide with that.

When it came up to the committee, then I, as chairman, spoke against it, and I selected a subcommittee to investigate the charges placed against Brother Hammond.

Mr. MOSIER. What were those charges?

Mr. EAGAR. They accused him of conduct unbecoming a union member and an executive of the local union, but they did not state definitely what those things were. They just placed charges of conduct unbecoming a union member.

Mr. MOSIER. Were those charges made by individuals you know personally as Communists?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Go ahead.

Mr. EAGAR. Then they brought him into the joint council, which is the governing body of the local there; they were the trial committee. He was tried and suspended from the office of vice president.

Mr. MOSIER. He was suspended?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Then what happened to you as president?

Mr. EAGAR. That was one of the reasons the Communist Party had against me, because they said it compelled them to have to refer to the other plants, when they felt they should have gotten support from me in the Ternstedt plants.

Then the next time they checked up on me was when they went into the local election for the election of officials of our local, where all of the plants participated in the election of the local officers.

Mr. MOSIER. When was that?

Mr. EAGAR. Last March.

Mr. MOSIER. March of 1938?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir. At that time they wanted me to campaign in my plants for the Communist Party slate for the local union, and I refused to do it, and they told me at that time they would discredit me in the plants or that they would see that I would not any longer be chairman of the Ternstedt, or of any of the committees.

Mr. MOSIER. Did the Communists have a slate of candidates for officers of the union which they were trying to put over at the election?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know how they constructed that slate, how they got it together?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes; they usually hold caucus meetings.

Mr. MOSIER. They held a caucus meeting?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Off by themselves some place?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, and there they decide who should be the elected officers, and then they get their party members throughout the plants to campaign for those people. That is how they get them elected.

Mr. MOSIER. As to all the other men in the plant, do they appreciate the fact that these Communists are trying to elect Communists?

Mr. EAGAR. It is not generally known in the plant because if any man from the plant tries to run for any office, unless he has the support of the Communist Party, there is not much chance of his getting elected.

Mr. MOSIER. There is not much chance?

Mr. EAGAR. No.

Mr. MOSIER. Are they so strong that they can block the election of a man in the plant?

Mr. EAGAR. The average man working in the plant has not any organization at the back of him, and they have got key men throughout the various sections of the plant, and their men then campaign for a certain slate throughout the entire plant; therefore, a man who has not got any organization to back him up has not got much chance of getting elected.

Mr. MASON. Were you backed by the Communist unit when you were elected as chairman?

Mr. EAGAR. No, I was not, because the first chairman of Ternstedt was not elected by the membership, but was selected by the committee, because when we started to function in Ternstedt we did not have a very large membership, and rather than hold an election for plant chairman and other officers, they were more or less appointed at that time.

Mr. MASON. You were then selected by this committee, and practically appointed?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. And at this election that you are speaking of you were up for election on a vote?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes.

Mr. MOSIER. So that at the election in March of this year you were removed.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. As chairman?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Who succeeded you?

Mr. EAGAR. Edward Cote.

Mr. MOSIER. Is he a Communist or a Socialist, or what is he?

Mr. EAGAR. I do not know what his political affiliations are.

Mr. MOSIER. Was he backed by the Communists?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, he was.

Mr. MOSIER. He was the Communist candidate?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. For chairman of your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know a man by the name of Novak, whose name has been brought into our hearings here?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Was he in your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. He is the organizer for the Ternstedt plants. He was an international organizer but was removed by Homer Martin. He was reemployed by our local union and assigned to the Ternstedt plants. He is still an organizer for the Ternstedt plants, so that at their last election he was elected as State Senator.

Mr. MOSIER. State Senator in the State of Michigan?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. On what ticket, do you know?

Mr. EAGAR. He ran on the Democratic ticket.

Mr. MOSIER. He is a Communist?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What is his first name?

Mr. EAGAR. Stanley.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know a man by the name of Rust?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Who is he?

Mr. EAGAR. He is a grievance committeeman in the Ternstedt plants.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know what Rust's first name is?

Mr. EAGAR. His first name is William.

Mr. MOSIER. And you say he is a grievance man?

Mr. EAGAR. A grievance committeeman.

Mr. MOSIER. In your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Is he a Communist?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Is he active in the Communist Party, if you know?

Mr. EAGAR. I think he is financial secretary of the Communist unit operating in the Ternstedt plants.

Mr. MOSIER. He is the financial secretary of the Communist unit which operates in your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know a man by the name of Wisherman, or something like that?

Mr. EAGAR. I know a man by the name of Joe Urban.

Mr. MOSIER. Who is Joe Urban?

Mr. EAGAR. He is a committeeman in Ternstedt, and also on the bargaining committee.

Mr. MOSIER. Is he active at all in Communist affairs?

Mr. EAGAR. He is a Communist organizer for the Ternstedt unit.

Mr. MOSIER. He is a Communist organizer?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know a man by the name of Maderios?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What is his first name?

Mr. EAGAR. George.

Mr. MOSIER. Is he in your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Tell the committee who he is, if you know.

Mr. EAGAR. He is chief shop steward, department No. 19.

Mr. MOSIER. Is he active in the Communist group in your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. He is treasurer of the Communist unit of our plant.

Mr. MOSIER. He is treasurer of the Communist unit of your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Who is Irene Young, whom you referred to a moment ago?

Mr. EAGAR. She is on the bargain committee of the Ternstedt plant, and recording secretary of local union 174.

Mr. MOSIER. Is she active in this Communist group in the plant?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. How many women does your plant employ?

Mr. EAGAR. The last estimate we had, which was probably over a year ago now, there were somewhere between 5,300 and 5,500 women.

Mr. MOSIER. Roughly, half of the plant. Irene Young is secretary for the entire local 174.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know a man by the name of Quirenal?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What is his first name?

Mr. EAGAR. I do not know.

Mr. MOSIER. Is he in your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What is his position?

Mr. EAGAR. He is chief shop steward of department 118.

Mr. MOSIER. Is he active in the Communist group?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know a man by the name of Hell in your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. No, sir; I do not know a man by the name of Hell in the Ternstedt plant, but I know a man by that name in the Cadillac plant.

Mr. MOSIER. What is his first name?

Mr. EAGAR. John.

Mr. MOSIER. John Hell?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Who is John Hell?

Mr. EAGAR. I believe he was a member of the executive board, and vice president of the local union last year. I believe he is a committeeman in the Cadillac plant.

Mr. MOSIER. Is he a member of the Communist group?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Active in the elections and in the affairs of this local?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know Weinstone?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Weinstone is not in Detroit any longer, is he? He has been transferred, has he not, to New York?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. Weinstone was district organizer, was he not, for the Communist Party in the State of Michigan?

Mr. EAGAR. I understand he was the State secretary.

Mr. MOSIER. I believe his name is William Weinstone.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, there seems to be a man by the name of Hundlay.

Mr. EAGAR. The name is Hartley.

Mr. MOSIER. What is his first name?

Mr. EAGAR. I do not know his first name.

Mr. MOSIER. Is he in your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. He is one of the officials of the local. He is welfare director of the local.

Mr. MOSIER. Is he a member of the Communist group?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. Eagar, these names I have mentioned to you are merely mentioned to bring out some of the names of those known as active participants in this Communistic group in your plant. Do you know what influence this group exercises in the U. A. W. A.?

Mr. EAGAR. What influence?

Mr. MOSIER. What influence they exercise. I think you told the committee, or, at least, I gathered from what you said that they have the dominating control of your plant.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. They elect the officers.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir. Those people I mentioned, or some of them, are in the top committee at Ternstedt, and some of them are local officers.

Mr. MOSIER. Do those men admit that they are members of the Communist Party, or do you just think they are? How do you really know they are?

Mr. EAGAR. While I was plant chairman of Ternstedt I was called into several Communist unit meetings on questions of policy that the Communist unit would like to see put through in Ternstedt.

Mr. MOSIER. You were called into unit meetings?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. On questions of policy that the Communist group wanted adopted?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And there you saw certain people present?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Purportedly representing the Communist Party?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Well, I have named to you some of the persons present at those meetings.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Is it a fact or not that to at least a certain group of labor in your plant these people are known by reputation as Communists?

Mr. EAGAR. No, sir; they are not.

Mr. MOSIER. But you know them to be, do you not?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And some other laborers in the plant know them to be Communists?

Mr. EAGAR. I guess they do.

Mr. MOSIER. I do not mean to say that the rank and file of the men working in the plant know that, but you leaders know them to be Communists.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. So there is no question but what at all times they are working as active members of the Communist Party.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir; that is true.

Mr. MASON. While the rank and file of the people working in the plant did not know or realize that these people occupying these important places were Communists?

Mr. EAGAR. That is true.

Mr. MASON. That was carefully kept from the rank and file of the voters?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You say that your unit has 10,000 members?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. When you have a meeting of your unit, how many of those members will attend, as a general rule?

Mr. EAGAR. When we first started the organization there would probably be 1,000 people attending the meetings, but after a while the plant meetings fell down until we have had at the last few plant meetings probably not more than 150 people.

Mr. MOSIER. One hundred and fifty people would attend.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Naturally you would preside while you were the chairman?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And you would have 150 people attending the meetings in the room?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. So that its small Communist group could come into a meeting of 150 members and accomplish some objectives that they could not accomplish if you had three or four thousand present; is that true?

Mr. EAGAR. That is correct.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you tell the committee—it has been told before here in relation to other plants and other local units—just for the purposes of the record what you do?

Describe a meeting that you have had of your local where the Communists tried to have some kind of motion or resolution adopted. How do they do it?

Mr. EAGAR. It is generally done in this manner: They first contact whoever is the plant chairman, and after they make the motion he is supposed to recognize only those people who will speak in favor of the motion.

Mr. MOSIER. Only those people who will speak in favor of the motion.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. He does not recognize anybody who will take the floor and oppose the motion?

Mr. MOSIER. All right; go ahead.

Mr. EAGAR. Secondly, they will have one of their group to move the previous question. That shuts off debate. They will wrangle over the question before they call the previous question. They will talk a long time, and the people will get tired of listening, so that when the previous question comes up they are anxious to get the question off the floor.

They put it over in that way. They usually accomplish their purpose in the vote, while nobody in the opposition has an opportunity to speak.

Mr. MOSIER. They are being trained to put through a particular motion. They move the previous question, and the motion is agreed to. In that way they put through motions and resolutions.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know whether or not those tactics that are employed in passing resolutions are planned beforehand or before the meeting is held?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir; it is planned.

Mr. MOSIER. Those tactics are planned out before the meeting, at meetings that these people hold among themselves previous to your main meeting?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know why more of the men in this industrial plant do not attend any of those meetings? Are there any reasons you know for their staying away?

Mr. EAGAR. Most of them that speak to me on that particular subject say this—that “when we go to a plant meeting we want to discuss the affairs of our plant, and we are not interested in what is going on in Spain, China, Russia, Germany, or anywhere else.” They say: “When we go to meetings we always have suffered from a whole lot of talk on questions that we are not interested in.” That is the reason they stay away.

Mr. MOSIER. The discussion of those questions comes from this group of Communists within your unit.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. They take up the time of the employees discussing Spain, Russia, Germany, China, and so forth?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And that is the reason that more of these employees do not attend the meetings?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know whether or not the Communists have attempted, and, if so, have they succeeded in the attempt, to keep employees away from the meetings; or, in other words, to keep the meetings down to a small group of people?

Mr. EAGAR. I have spoken on that particular subject myself.

It was thought we would have to get out long political speeches in the plant meetings if we intended to build up the plant meetings. I was told at that time, "How can you educate workers if they do not know the conditions existing in other countries? Therefore, it is more or less imperative that people should know that it would be better to educate a small group than just half educate a large group."

Mr. MOSIER. That is the answer they gave you.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. They wanted to educate those workers on conditions in other countries.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You heard their speeches from time to time in the meetings, did you not?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. In their speeches did they say, or did they not, that the condition of the workingman in this country is miserable?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And did they point out to your people that the condition of the workingman in some countries, particularly in Soviet Russia and Loyalist Spain, are much better than it is over here?

Mr. EAGAR. They did not put it exactly that way, but they tried to show that the condition of the working class here is more or less going down, whereas the condition of the workers in Russia was going up. They said that the condition in Russia was going up, whereas the condition of workers in the United States, under the present capitalistic system, is going down.

Mr. MOSIER. They tried to convince the American workingman that his condition is constantly growing worse.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. Suppose, at one of these plant meetings, when the Communists came to the chairman and asked him to recognize those who were favorable to the proposition being put before the committee, and to refuse those in opposition, he should say, "No; I will give equal opportunity to the opponents": what would happen then?

Mr. EAGAR. Well, the only thing that would happen would be that they would start a campaign in an effort to discredit that chairman.

Mr. MASON. And because of the fear of this discrediting and the fear of losing his office, the chairman of the meeting will give what these Communists desire.

Mr. EAGAR. It is not exactly fear of losing office, but it is this way: These people can discredit the chairman in the eyes of the workers, and there is nothing that a fellow in the shop dislikes more than to be called a stooge for the company. That is what the man does not want.

Mr. MASON. That is really the chief weapon with which they accomplish their purpose.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. It is blackening the character of the person who will not concede what they want.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You came before this committee in response to a subpoena issued by the committee, did you not?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You are not a so-called labor spy?

Mr. EAGAR. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You are not appearing here for any capitalist or employer in any capacity, to say anything about these people to the committee.

Mr. EAGAR. No, sir; I do not think that even in the shop they can give me credit for that, because I am never in sight of the boss.

Mr. MOSIER. You are interested in standing up for trade union organizations?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Legitimate trade union organizations?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. For the American working men and women, so as to improve their condition?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, since you were removed as chairman of your group, have you continued to keep in touch with the activities of your plant group down there so as to know what is going on?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir; because I am still on the committee in Ternstedt, and I am also a delegate to the joint council of the local unions.

Mr. MOSIER. You are still on the committee for your plant, and are a delegate to that joint council?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You are still on the bargaining committee?

Mr. EAGAR. No, sir; I am not on the bargaining committee now. We have a bargaining committee and a grievance committee, and I am still on the grievance committee.

Mr. MOSIER. From your experience in this unit of your plant, and from your experience as an official of the unit, what would you say as to whether, or not, the policies of that unit in your plant are controlled by the Communist Party?

Mr. EAGAR. Well, the policies in our local and in our plants are controlled by the Communist Party.

Mr. MOSIER. All of the policies are controlled by the Communist Party?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. In other words, that small group of people who are joined in an organization and working under parliamentary procedure can go into these meetings attended by a small number of working people and dominate the meetings.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. When you were chairman of your local, did you ever have any occasion to observe any motions made by any of these people to pay out of your company union's treasury any money for any organizations in which they might be interested?

Mr. EAGAR. They did not bring motions like that up in plant meetings. The financial set-up we have is governed by what we call the legislative body of the local union, with the joint council. They have brought motions up there for organizations in which they were interested.

Mr. MOSIER. What organizations were they?

Mr. EAGAR. Only recently they brought up one to give some money, I think \$500, or something like that, to be donated for bringing home Lincoln Battalion men from Spain.

Mr. MOSIER. Members of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. To bring them back from Spain?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir. They told us at that time that it would cost \$125 per man, and that it was up to the body to see how many men they were willing to bring back.

Mr. MOSIER. What happened in that situation?

Mr. EAGAR. At that meeting they were not able to put it over. Although most of the delegates to the joint council are not Communists, a certain percentage of them are, but they could not see their way to spend money of the U. A. W. A. to bring back people that they had not sent to Spain. For that reason they were not able to get away with that.

Mr. MOSIER. They did not get money for that particular purpose at that time.

Mr. EAGAR. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You say that the group considering this particular motion were not all Communists. What percentage of that group would you say were Communists?

Mr. EAGAR. While I have acquaintance with the 50 plants, or the 45 that have delegates to the joint council, I cannot exactly say.

Mr. MOSIER. It is your observation, is it not, that Communists do not care about numbers, or large numbers, but what they want are the strategic positions in the organizations?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Is that what they tried to do in your organization?

Mr. EAGAR. That is what it seems to be.

Mr. MOSIER. They tried to get the president, the vice president, and financial secretary; was that true in your unit?

Mr. EAGAR. They feel that it does not matter much if they have only Communists in those positions, provided they have men in those positions who will go down the line for their policies.

Mr. MOSIER. Or men in sympathy with their policies.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Whether they are actually members of the party, or not, they do not care.

Mr. EAGAR. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. So long as he is what has been termed a "fellow traveler" and goes along with them.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir; that is true.

Mr. MOSIER. I think that, perhaps, you have mentioned the political affiliations of some of the officials of your plant local. Could you give that to us? Could you give us the political affiliations of the officers of your local union?

Mr. EAGAR. I can give it for quite a few of them.

Mr. MOSIER. For the purposes of the record, go right ahead and tell us. For instance, there is Reuthen, the president; what is his political affiliation?

Mr. EAGAR. He is a Socialist or a radical Socialist or revolutionary Socialist.

Mr. MOSIER. Which one of the Reuthens is president?

Mr. EAGAR. Walter Reuthen is president.

Mr. MOSIER. And Victor Reuthen?

Mr. EAGAR. He is organizer of the local.

Mr. MOSIER. With what party is he affiliated?

Mr. EAGAR. He was also discharged from the international union and rehired by our local.

Mr. MOSIER. Does he belong to the Socialist Party or the Communist Party?

Mr. EAGAR. To the Socialist Party.

Mr. MOSIER. How about George Edwards?

Mr. EAGAR. He belongs to the Socialist Party. He is organizer in our local.

Mr. MOSIER. How about Chuck Walters?

Mr. EAGAR. He is an organizer, and belongs to the Socialist Party.

Mr. MOSIER. What about Bob Kanton?

Mr. EAGAR. He is an organizer and a Socialist Party member.

Mr. MOSIER. What about George Young?

Mr. EAGAR. George Young is an executive board member, and belongs to the Socialist Party.

Mr. MOSIER. You have already testified about Novick. What is Bill McKie?

Mr. EAGAR. He is an organizer and a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MOSIER. You have testified that Novick is a Communist. Bill McKie is what?

Mr. EAGAR. A Communist.

Mr. MOSIER. What about Hartley?

Mr. EAGAR. Hartley is a welfare director, and is a Communist Party member.

Mr. MOSIER. You have testified about Irene Young. What about Martha Strong?

Mr. EAGAR. She is an executive board member, and is in the Communist Party.

Mr. MOSIER. Is there anyone else here I have not mentioned that you can recall?

Mr. EAGAR. No, sir; with the exception of our educational director, Charlie Nickelman. He is educational director for our plant.

Mr. MOSIER. He is the educational director?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir; and treasurer of Local 174.

Mr. MOSIER. What party does he belong to?

Mr. EAGAR. The Communist Party.

Mr. MOSIER. From your experience, who would you say are the leading members of the Communist Party who are active in your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. I think I have mentioned most of the names before.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know a fellow by the name of Steve Dulso-vich?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Who is he?

Mr. EAGAR. He is chief steward in department 114. a Communist Party member.

Mr. MOSIER. Is he a man in your plant?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. I believe you testified, giving the reasons why in such a large plant as this, a small organization can get control and keep it.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, Mr. Eagar, have you anything else you would like to say to this committee on this question that we have not asked you that you think of, about your particular plant?

Mr. EAGAR. No; I do not think so.

Mr. MOSIER. You have been fighting this Communist group, have you, and the Socialist group with them?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes.

Mr. MOSIER. What you are trying to do in your plant is to get rid of that element.

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Eagar, do you not feel that the future welfare, growth and prosperity of the union depends upon getting rid of these subversive elements that have gotten into your ranks?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. Do you believe that many of your union members are beginning to realize that thing?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes they are, sir.

Mr. MASON. And because of that do you expect that in the near future the rank and file of these union members are going to crowd out, and push out, and force out, these subversive elements?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes; I believe they will eventually do so.

Mr. MASON. I think, Mr. Eagar, it is the testimony of such men as you that will bring this situation not only before your union members, but the Nation as a whole, and cause them to realize the menace these people are to the legitimate union organizations, and the sooner we do that the better it will be for all of us.

Mr. MOSIER. I will ask you this question. Mr. Eagar, if you know the answer. Do you know whether any of these members of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party who are active in your plants are aliens?

Mr. EAGAR. I do not know that, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You do not know that, you have never checked that up?

Mr. EAGAR. If they were aliens they would not be reemployed, not for Ternstedt, after the last lay-off.

Mr. MOSIER. The policy of your company—

Mr. EAGAR. The policy of the company I work for is this. A man will get employment if he has his first papers, but if he does not have his citizenship papers within the time specified by the law, which is 5 years, after the next lay-off that comes he will not be hired.

Mr. MOSIER. But he will be hired if he has his first citizenship papers?

Mr. EAGAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. I think that is all. Mr. Eagar, and on behalf of the committee I want to thank you for coming down here. We appreciate very much your cooperation, and if you have anything else you think the committee should know, I hope you will communicate with us.

The committee will adjourn subject to the call of the chairman.

(Thereupon, the subcommittee adjourned to meet subject to the call of the chairman.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1938

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

FURTHER TESTIMONY OF JOHN C. METCALFE

The CHAIRMAN. Before we take further testimony of Mr. Metcalfe the Chair wishes to place in the record an article by D. J. Saposs in *Labor Age*, the issue of December 1931.

In the *Labor Age* under date of December 1931 among the contributors was David J. Saposs, at present chief economist of the National Labor Relations Board, who is described "as instructor at Brookland Labor College * * *".

* * * Last summer, while in Europe, he attended the Congress of the Labor and Socialist International about which he reports in this issue.

In this article Mr. Saposs sets out the minority and majority views of delegates at this convention and makes the following personal comments thereon:

This is a fallacious attitude, the Socialist movement must tell the people that capitalism cannot be stabilized and that the world cannot be saved by capitalist devices. * * * But bourgeois democracy is sham. When it is evident that socialism is the only remedy it is not worth saving a democracy in which Socialist parties only collaborate with capitalism. * * * If in the attempt to carry out such a program political action fails, then the workers must unhesitatingly resort to organized force. The International must take the position that if another war occurs the workers will destroy capitalism. With that end in view the workers must be prepared to stretch arms across the frontiers in case of war and definitely win power for themselves.

These are excerpts from Mr. Saposs' article, the whole of which will be incorporated in the record. They reveal his attitude toward the American form of government and the capitalist system under which we live, which is a very distinct part of our whole system of government.

(The article referred to is as follows:)

LEFT OPPOSITION IN THE LABOR AND SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

By D. J. Saposs

A small minority in the Fourth Congress of the Labor and Socialist International held in Vienna from July 4 to August 1, led by the British Independent Labor Party, took issue with the overwhelming majority. The differences were not so much over fundamental principles as over the mode of procedure. The minority demanded more positive, energetic, and uncompromising action in the attempt of the Socialists to cope with the present world ailments. Its spokesmen maintained that economic conditions are ripe for socialism and that the International should therefore direct its forces for the immediate overthrow of capitalism. Instead of taking this positive position, the majority favors temporizing. This is a fallacious attitude; the Socialist movement must tell the people that capitalism cannot be stabilized and that the world cannot be saved by capitalist devices.

The opposition further demanded that the International state definitely that its program of action means "a declaration of uncompromising war on capitalism." It wanted the International to emphasize the urgent need of the workers to rally around the "Socialist movement in order to achieve international socialism." Hence, it is imperative that the International unequivocally reject the present "policy of toleration and of cooperation with capitalist parties," because such a policy "always results in maintaining the principle of the capitalist system."

As for democracy, the opposition also wants to safeguard it. But bourgeois democracy is a sham. When it is evident that socialism is the only remedy it is not worth saving a democracy in which Socialist parties only collaborate with capitalism. In this connection the opposition also called attention to the fact that fascism has grown side by side with coalition governments in which Socialists participated. Thus, the dilatory procedure of the majority Socialists is enabling the reactionary forces to entrench themselves. Consequently, when the majority says it will resort to force only if obstructionist tactics are resorted to by the capitalists and the reactionary forces, it is only waiting until the harm is done before it acts. As conditions stand now, slow-going democracy involves the workers in suffering and their leaders in shifty compromises. From a revolutionary point of view, democracy means meeting the situation and not running away from it by forming coalitions with bourgeois governments.

One of the chief spokesmen for the opposition ended by proclaiming "that the only way out of the present situation is to raise the banner for a new social order; and, if that is done, socialism will be gotten without a catastrophe."

In similar terms the minority attacked the attitude of the majority on war and disarmament. It asserted that the dangers of war were greater now than at any time since the peace treaties were signed. Moreover, it had no confidence in the League of Nations or the Geneva Disarmament Commission, since they are dominated by the imperialistic powers. What the international socialist movement must do is to appeal to the workers and not to governments. It must take the position that socialists cannot support any war. There must be no compromise with war any more than there must be compromise with capitalist parties in parliament. Socialists must always vote against military credits, and when they come in control of government they must set the example by disarming. If in the attempt to carry out such a program political action fails, then the workers must unhesitatingly resort to organized force. The International must take the position that if another war occurs the workers will destroy capitalism. With that end in view the workers must be prepared to stretch arms across the frontiers in case of war and definitely win power for themselves.

The Congress was unevenly divided in voting strength. On all divisions the majority overwhelmingly outvoted the opposition. All the old and outstanding leaders were on the side of the majority, whereas the minority leaders consisted of some of the well-known newer and, par consequent, younger men in the movement. This left opposition in the Socialist International has just appeared and was not well organized. Also, because of the provision making it possible for delegations to resort to the unit rule it is difficult to estimate its exact strength. This factor is illustrated by the procedure of the American delegation. Although a militant minority presented its view in delegation meetings, the entire delegation is recorded as voting with the majority.

The difference between the majority and opposition is one that has agitated the radical movements since their advent. Hence in debates the fundamental issue was between cautious and slow against energetic and forceful procedure in order to remedy conditions and to attain socialism. The overwhelming majority counseled moderation and cooperation with the democratic and bourgeois liberal elements, working at the same time for a gradual introduction of socialism. To them the need of checkmating fascism was the chief concern since democracy is the vehicle upon which socialism will gradually reach its aspired goal.

The small minority, on the other hand, demanded militant action that would primarily wage battle on the enemy, capitalism, instead of using up too much energy in cooperating with the uncertain capitalist forces no matter how liberal and democratic they may be. And instead of only resisting the advance of fascism through maneuvers, they would immediately wage battle on the entire front, since fascism is but a foil of capitalism.

It would seem that both elements favor aggressive action. The majority, however, emphasizes militancy in defense of gains already made by labor, as well as in defense of democracy and against fascism and dictatorship. In contrast to the defensive militancy of the majority, the minority stresses the need of an offensive against capitalism by initiating an immediate struggle for the rapid achievement of socialism. It is for this reason that they are opposed to Socialists participating in coalition governments, in placing faith in the League of Nations, in agitating and petitioning against war, and in trusting liberal, capitalistic, and democratic elements.

The CHAIRMAN. This morning we wish to take up certain organizations, some of which we have not as yet investigated. The Chair believes that any organization in this country which is disseminating propaganda of a class, racial, or religious hatred character is un-American; or at least the question of un-Americanism is raised sufficiently to warrant this committee's consideration of such organizations.

There are 135 such organizations which have been reported to the Chair; of which number we have documents and literature from 73 on file, of which 54 have been checked. Of course, due to the lack of funds and an inadequate staff, we were unable to pursue the best course and subpoena the records of these organizations, together with their officers and directors. Had we done so, the cost would have exhausted our entire fund. It would have been necessary to have a number of accountants, and we would have needed the assistance of some lawyers. It was impossible to pursue that course.

But, because this is a very important question, we followed the next best method which was to send our investigator to each one of these organizations, accompanied by a court reporter.

The organization was told that the committee wanted to find out the facts with reference to their activities. They were told the committee did not assume that they were un-American, did not have any preconceived views on the matter, but that we wanted to afford them an opportunity to set forth their side of the case.

Without exception, all these organizations refused to show their books, their membership list, their contributions, or anything of that sort, although they were fully apprised of the fact that the whole matter would be given to the public.

With that preliminary statement, we wish to take up some of these organizations this morning. We are not going to consider any organization whose literature and pamphlets and documents we do not have, such literature and pamphlets advocating racial or religious hatred. We are going to consider only the 54 organizations that have been checked.

Mr. Metcalfe, is my statement true that you went to 54 of these organizations and took with you a reporter?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir: a court reporter.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you say to the representatives of these organizations?

Mr. METCALFE. As many as we were able to contact out of the 54, they were advised that my visit was purely of an informative nature, that we were making no charges, but that we had certain documents, literature, letters—whatever it might be—which we thought ought to be explained and we were interested purely in their functions, in their plans, in their ideals, and sundry activities.

The CHAIRMAN. Insofar as it related to antiracial or antireligious activities; is that correct?

Mr. METCALFE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. I think this statement should be made also in this connection. Of course, strictly speaking, fascism represents a corporate state and nazi-ism represents national socialism. Both are founded upon religious and racial hatreds. What these organizations have in common with the Nazi and Fascist ideology is racial or religious hatred. I mean by that there is no evidence other than racial and religious hatred of any fascistic tendencies on their part, is there?

Mr. METCALFE. In some cases we find it goes further than that.

The CHAIRMAN. It goes further?

Mr. METCALFE. As, for instance, you will recall in previous hearings we submitted literature from some of these organizations which carried the swastika right on its propaganda; and also we found that their literature had been sent to Germany and was being sent back by the German Government to various people in the United States, showing a direct relationship.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not true with reference to all of these organizations, is it?

Mr. METCALFE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And you will indicate as to which ones it is true?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes. I stated it is true in some cases.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you explain the letter that you secured possession of?

Mr. METCALFE. On a recent visit to Pittsburgh we noted that someone was attempting to create an uprising among the Negroes in the Pittsburgh area. They were creating a wave of anti-Semitism among the Negroes. We investigated it a little, because it was going down at the time; it was being taken care of by itself pretty well. Now we are informed as to the origin of this difficulty among the colored people in Pittsburgh.

The information we obtained came from Robert L. Vann, who is a former Assistant United States Attorney General, but is now the editor of the Pittsburgh Courier, which is, I believe, the largest colored paper in the United States.

He called our attention to the fact that he had received a letter and propaganda from the German-American Bund in reference to the colored situation. In other words, it was the German-American Bund which was attempting to stir up trouble among the colored people in Pittsburgh against another minority.

The CHAIRMAN. Against the Jews?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us be specific.

Mr. METCALFE. Well, I had said it was anti-Semetic. I should like to introduce in evidence this letter by Robert L. Vann. It is as follows:

PITTSBURGH COURIER,
2528 Centre Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., November 14, 1938.

HON. MARTIN DIES.

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The enclosed letter, as well as the printed matter, came to me through the mails this morning. I am forwarding the whole business to you with the hope that it will be of some service to you.

I hope you will succeed in having the American people know and understand once and for all what it means to be an American.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. VANN.

Then there is enclosed this letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The original letter?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes. These are all original documents. This letter is signed by Fritz R. H. Huebner.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. METCALFE. The date of the letter is November 8.

The CHAIRMAN. 1938?

Mr. METCALFE. 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom is it addressed?

Mr. METCALFE. It is addressed to Mr. Vann. Mr. Huebner is the editor of Art and Industry in North Hollywood, Calif.

The CHAIRMAN. What position does he hold with the bund?

Mr. METCALFE. He is with the German-American Bund.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he an official of the bund?

Mr. METCALFE. He is known to be an official of the German-American Bund on the coast.

He states as follows:

ART & INDUSTRY.

THE WORLD OVER.

5049 Bakman Avenue, North Hollywood, California, U. S. A.,

November 8, 1938.

Mr. ROBERT L. VANN.

Publisher, Pittsburgh Courier.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed is a copy of leaflets printed here in California and edited by me.

Understanding your problem I herewith am offering my help to you, and I am requesting yours in return.

If you contemplate issuing news for reprint on your problem and on the question of the next presidential campaign, I would be very glad to have my name and address on your mailing list.

Very truly yours,

FRITZ R. H. HUEBNER, Editor.

FREE AMERICA

He encloses a swastika circular which is called Free America.

The CHAIRMAN. This circular is headed Free America. There is a swastika under that, and then it reads:

THE PAN-ARAB CONGRESS IN CAIRO

On the 7th of October the Pan-Arab Congress was officially opened in the presence of 2,000 participants who were invited. The president of the Congress is the president of the Egyptian Chamber, Barakat Pasha. Among the dele-

gates were numerous ministers, ex-ministers, Chamber presidents and senators. The Crown Prince of Yemen was also present.

The leader of the Irak delegation demanded among other things the immediate cessation of Jewish immigration into Palestine. The president of the Syrian Chamber put forward a number of suggestions for the solution of the Palestine question which had the approval of the Grand Mufti. These suggestions contained the four significant claims:

1. The renunciation of any kind of a partition of Palestine.

2. The Balfour Declaration to be declared void.

3. Union of Palestine with Syria.

4. Alliance of the new Arabian State with England and France, after the manner of Irak.

The Jewish press naturally rages against the Congress. Only the Jews of Baghdad are clearsighted enough to withdraw from the idea of a Zionist State.

JOIN THE BUND

MILITANT ORGANIZATION OF PATRIOTIC AMERICANS

634 W. Fifteenth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. METCALFE. I may call attention to the fact that this address, 634 West Fifteenth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., is the western headquarters of the German-American Bund. It is the Deutscheshaus.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us take up these organizations you have investigated. The first one is America First, Inc., Washington, D. C. Have you your file on that?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. This is an organization which we have not as yet checked, but on which we have considerable literature of an anti-Semitic character, and also of a pro-Japanese character.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is the head of this organization?

Mr. METCALFE. The head of this organization is James True.

The CHAIRMAN. James True?

Mr. METCALFE. James True. He publishes what is known as Industrial Control Reports.

The CHAIRMAN. He publishes books and pamphlets, does he not?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; he does.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about the size of this organization, whether it has any members, to speak of?

Mr. METCALFE. It is more of a publication idea: subscriptions for literature, and so forth, that he puts out, such as Industrial Control Reports.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to read some excerpts from some of these documents in order to have the record show their antiracial character.

Here is one report dated September 3, 1938:

Industrial Control Reports, issued weekly by the James True Associates, 307 Insurance Building, Washington, D. C.

Here is the way it reads:

WORLD COMMUNISM'S LAST STAND

Events of this week plainly show the determination of the international war makers to bring about a vast world conflict. With the return from Europe of several Jewish members of the administration, our newspapers break into energetic cooperation with the controlled press of the world. Thousands of propagandists, on papers throughout the country, force war scares into headlines that are never justified by the facts, and write lurid hate fiction, disguised as news, which the papers are induced to publish by organized Jewish advertisers.

All Jews are promoting war in their hatred of Germany and Fascism, their repetition of lying propaganda, and their demands for a union of democratic

countries. Our papers not only lie and distort the news from Europe but also suppress many vitally important facts. The Jewish control of the news is obvious in many instances; in all others it is easy to trace. Three times during the last 4 years we have published the statement that the personnel of the New York office of the Associated Press, which handles most of the foreign news, was more than 60 percent Jewish. There is no indication of a change. In the handling of the news, the Jewish religious faith in fraud and deception finds its ultimate expression in the "bemusing of the Gentiles" and the promotion of world war.

In his *Nouveau Mercure*, the Jewish authority, Rene Groos, wrote: "There is a Jewish conspiracy against all nations; it occupies almost everywhere the avenue of power—a double assault of Jewish revolution and Jewish finance." And many similar statements are to be found in the writings of other Jewish authorities.

The reasons for the present assault may be found in most of the countries of the world. The new deals of England, France, Spain, and China are breaking down or blowing up. In this country a reversal is plainly on the way. It is now apparent that the British Empire cannot be dismembered, and France and United States taken over by "peaceful" subversion or internal strife, because of the world-wide awakening as to the Jewish control. A gigantic world war, which is being promoted, and for which "incidents" are being planned, would leave all countries prostrated and easy prey for the international Jewish interests. It is not only our own but the world's greatest menace at the present time.

Mr. MASON. These are Industrial Reports!

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; these are Industrial Reports. In view of the fact that thousands of these documents are going out over the country every day, the Chair feels that some attention should be devoted to them, because the information of the Chair is that these things are reaching people all over the country, in small towns and villages.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Chairman, it is of interest to note that these Industrial Reports are coming from Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. I think I mentioned before that some of these were sent over to Germany and in turn mailed back.

Mr. METCALFE. They come right here, shipped in by the German Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is another excerpt from the issue of June 25, 1938:

This failure is most evident in the affairs of the Roosevelt family. No other occupants of the White House have had such a continuous blare of publicity; but despite the favorable ballyhoo the popularity of the family steadily has declined. Now the people are ignoring the propaganda in contemplation of the facts. They realize that no other family in the country's history has exploited the White House for profit. They detect hypocrisy in an attitude that accumulates unearned wealth while stridently appealing for humanitarianism. And Nation-wide resentment is building up over political and economic fallacies, vote buying, exploitation of misery, and the Jewish control.

There is no use encumbering the record with all of these, but they will be put together in a file as an exhibit. I just wanted to read enough from them to show the type of propaganda it is.

Mr. METCALFE. There is only one other point of interest in connection with Mr. True and that is that he is, of course, well known among the rest of the boys around the country who are active in similar campaigns in spreading antiracial propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, he works in cooperation with others engaged in the same kind of business?

Mr. METCALFE. He is also an ardent booster of the Silver Shirts, Pelley's organization.

The CHAIRMAN. And in his literature he praises Hitler upon occasions, does he not?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; Hitler and the Japanese.

The CHAIRMAN. Take up the organization, America in Danger!

Mr. METCALFE. That is another organization which we have not as yet checked.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any of their literature?

Mr. METCALFE. I have literature on this organization.

The CHAIRMAN. This is an organization that is supposed to have its headquarters in Omaha, Nebr.?

Mr. METCALFE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. We have no evidence that it has any memberships?

Mr. METCALFE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be one of these letterhead organizations?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes. It also publishes a sort of a news letter.

The CHAIRMAN. I have here a publication headed—

AMERICA IN DANGER

Charles B. Hudson, editor, lecturer, Omaha, Nebr.

Weekly exposé of un-Americanism in education, finance, labor, politics, and religion. Condensed news for truth-seeking readers. Subscription, \$1 for 10 weeks includes Interlocking Directorate chart that lists some of the leading radicals, organizations, and publications.

This is more or less of a racket, but I think it is well to expose some of these; have it in the record so people may see what it is. I will read an excerpt from this for the record.

Some idea as to that war maker, the Hidden Hand, gleaned from leading Jewish weekly THE AMERICAN HEBREW, 11-12-37 (CAPS in original and italicized words underlined):

"IT WAS THE IDEALISM of the leaders of the Russian Revolution, their devotion and sincerity alone, that saved Jews in Russia from being sacrificed as were their brethren in Germany. (See below.) *The fact is, that in Russia today, anti-Semitism is a crime* (punishable by death). A HEAVY RESPONSIBILITY rests upon 4,000,000 Jews of U. S. A., the necessity to supply leadership for the remaining three-quarters of the Jewish people in the world—the 5,000,000 Russian Jews alone excepted, *since as Jews, no problem exists for them* * * * (How can there be, since Jews are in control) * * * A UNITED FRONT IN JEWRY MUST BE ESTABLISHED * * * Jews must unite to defend themselves against the common enemy, recognizing that their enemies, *in order to preserve themselves* (what an admission for Jews to make that they are the destroyers), would seek to undermine the existence of Jews in every land where they reside. A NEW COUNCIL OF AMERICAN JEWRY MUST ARISE, dedicated to this one purpose * * *." Jewry's UNITED FRONT is one of Hidden Hand's chief weapons for destroying and enslaving Christendom.

PERSECUTION—A JOKE! Suppose you lived where your taxes were increasingly heavy. Where you were regimented from morn until night. Where liberty in the American sense is unknown. Suppose, too, that war is imminent—that bombs will soon rain on larger cities where you lived.

The whole argument is anti-Semitism, or an attack on Jews.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you locate the American Aryan Folk Association of Portland, Oreg.?

Mr. METCALFE. This organization also has offices in New York. It was checked, but it could not be located.

The CHAIRMAN. You could not locate the offices?

Mr. METCALFE. No, sir; they could not be located.

The CHAIRMAN. You could not locate the directors or officers?

Mr. METCALFE. No, sir. Its literature is of the same character.

The CHAIRMAN. This seems to be simply a reprint of an article by George E. Sokolsky. It does not seem to be an article from this association itself. This reads:

Awake, Americans! Before it is too late. Only organized defense will save you and your family, your American institutions and social life.

That is dated June 1937 and is signed "American Aryan Foly Association."

This is a pamphlet which evidently was distributed by this organization. It looks like another one of those rackets. What about this American Aryan Folk Association?

Mr. METCALFE. That is an organization I have listed here, but I have no record of it. So far as we know, it is being sponsored by H. H. Benish, who is a well-known British Fascist.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the American Christian Defenders? Did you check up on the American Christian Defenders?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; that is an organization of Col. E. N. Sanctuary, of New York City. Colonel Sanctuary was a speaker at one time before the German Bund.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the American Christian Defenders of New York City. It is amazing to believe that there could be this many organizations. The American people are so gullible that these organizations prey upon them. It appears to be a racket.

Mr. METCALFE. This man Colonel Sanctuary, whose address is 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., is the eastern representative of Harry Jung, of Chicago, who is the head or manager of the American Intelligence Federation.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any pamphlets issued by this particular organization?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; I have.

The CHAIRMAN. I see a report here. Suppose you read from this report. Is the literature issued by this Colonel Sanctuary largely anti-Semitic?

Mr. METCALFE. It is of that character.

The CHAIRMAN. I see here that they put out a song, American: A New Challenge, which reads:

Said Franklin D. on Election night, I'll find a crew to cure our plight,
And headed by his Tugwell boy to Moscow did they then deploy,
Returning with a plot so bold, exactly fitted Moscow's mold.
On men once free, in ways unkind, began on us slave chains to bind.

"Facing-Both-Ways," but mostly left, our freedom rights he has bereft,
As supine men in Congress hall, obeyed his every beck and call;
Co'ln and Cor'ran and "hot dog" boys have written bills which much annoys,
And stealing rights we once enjoyed, for this by Franklin were employed.

I am not going to quote from these publications, but you have read them over.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They are primarily anti-Semitic.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I see they have a chart here showing the various Communist organizations in the United States. Is that right?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You can give these papers to the reporter. Do you want to add anything to that?

MR. METCALFE. For instance, in the examination, here is a question he was asked:

Do you know Fritz Kuhn, of the German-American Bund?

His answer was, "I met him once."

Then he was asked:

What are your opinions of Mr. Kuhn and his activities with reference to the German-American Bund?

His answer was:

I think the German-American group, irrespective of what name they may be operating under, have shown very poor judgment in the campaigns which they have conducted because, professing to be staunch Americans, they at least have left the impression, possibly based upon evidence, that they are more pro-German than they are American. That is my reaction.

He also admits corresponding with George E. Deatherage, of St. Albans, chief of the Knights of the White Camelias.

THE CHAIRMAN. Can you produce a file on the White Camelia group? That seems to be a growing organization. Who is the head of the White Camelias?

MR. METCALFE. The head of the White Camelias committee is George E. Deatherage. He is also president of the American Nationalist Confederation. Both of those organizations have headquarters at St. Albans, W. Va. This is the same Deatherage from whom we introduced some literature sometime ago—literature with the swastika on it.

Quite a bit is known of Mr. Deatherage's activities.

THE CHAIRMAN. Here is one article which says that the swastika is the emblem of the American Nationalist Federation. So Deatherage is the head of the American Nationalist Confederation, and is also head of the Knights of the White Camelias.

MR. METCALFE. That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN. You do not have any literature of the White Camelias?

MR. METCALFE. Not here; but we have it in the files of the committee. We have copies of the magazine they publish.

THE CHAIRMAN. Later on we will want excerpts from the White Camelia publication.

MR. METCALFE. It is pretty vicious.

THE CHAIRMAN. I believe one of the principal activities of Deatherage is to print and publish the picture of every Jew who is connected with the Federal Government. He takes them up alphabetically.

MR. METCALFE. In that connection, that stunt is being worked, not just by Mr. Deatherage, but it is being done uniformly throughout the country. Later on we will give you the relation between them. That particular idea has been worked all across the country by different meetings and organizations.

THE CHAIRMAN. I will quote a few excerpts from this article. It says:

After much deliberation, your party council has decided to join our Canadian brothers in the selection of the swastika—as the emblem of this organization.

The swastika is and will remain the symbol of rally of the white race in its worldly effort to rid itself of Jewish economic and political yoke. As the Jews use the star of Zion as their international emblem, we use the swastika of our determination to cease allowing ourselves to be divided and destroyed by Jews—for the benefit of international Jewry.

I think that is enough of that particular article. Is this the investigation of Mr. Deatherage?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to read any excerpts from that?

Mr. METCALFE. I want to read about his teachings. For instance, he, too, is one of the men whose literature comes periodically from Germany into the United States after having been originated and printed here.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the White Camelia organization connected with the K. K. K.?

Mr. METCALFE. It has a relation to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it connected with the Women's Council?

Mr. METCALFE. No, sir. He explained to me that it was a separate organization that had not been functioning for many years, but it is now being revived; but its efforts are similar to those of the old Klan.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything else on that?

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Deatherage is generally well known among all those different leaders around the country, and they speak very kindly of him. Now, it was Deatherage who was to be the second public speaker at the Silver Shirt gathering.

The CHAIRMAN. He participated in the conferences in which they tried to get together their various groups.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; it was Deatherage who called the conference.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask about the American Fascists of Atlanta, Ga., I think. Do you know anything about that organization?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The American Fascists and the Order of Black Shirts, of Atlanta, Ga. Do you know who the head of that organization is?

Mr. METCALFE. No, sir. It is considered to be an offshoot of the Klan, but it is believed not to be active at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the American Fascists, of Chattanooga, Tenn.?

Mr. METCALFE. I have contacted that organization and have a report. That is George W. Christian's organization. He has many organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. There is evidently something wrong about him, because he has the American Reds Organization and the American Fascist Organization. They are chartered in the States.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. A man gets a charter and goes around with it.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have the American Reds, the American Fascists, the Liberty Party, Crusaders for Economic Liberty, Crusader White Shirts, and the Fifty Million Club for Economic Liberty. They are under the name of George W. Christian.

Mr. METCALFE. He resides at Chattanooga, Tenn.

The CHAIRMAN. He signs a letter, "Yours in the brotherhood of the bunk." Do you have any of his writings there?

Mr. METCALFE. Here is a paragraph from his literature entitled "Crusader White Shirts, Instructions to Organizers." In this circular he states in one paragraph the following:

The Crusader White Shirts will be a military organization armed with wooden staffs, officered and drilled in accordance with United States Army Regulations. They shall wear white shirts with a large red crusader cross on the front middle and with small crossed American and red crusader flags on the left breast, the white shirts denoting the purity of our purpose; the red crusader cross denoting the religious significance of the crusades; the American flag, patriotism; and the red crusader flag, courage and sacrifice.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the American Fascist Khaki Shirts of America, Philadelphia, Pa.? Do you know who the head of that organization is?

Mr. METCALFE. That organization is located in Philadelphia, supposedly, but I could not find it. The head of it, or the commander, so-called, is Art J. Smith. Another man who is known to be very active in the group is Maj. Luther Powell. It is an out-of-date organization, and has virtually passed out of existence.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the American Gentile Protective Association, of Chicago, Ill.? Did you check on that?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; in connection with the Chicago group. There are about 9 or 10 of them. I might add this, that as soon as one of them was checked, all the rest ran like wild rabbits, and it was hard to locate them. The result was that while we have considerable information about the American Gentile Protective Association, those people were in hiding. The leader of the organization is Mrs. Lois de Lafayette Washburn.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a nom de plume?

Mr. METCALFE. No, sir; she claims to be a descendant of General Lafayette. She has been a voluminous correspondent, I think, with a man named Frank W. Clark, of Tacoma, Wash. She has also distributed books for Pelley's organization, the Silver Shirts, as well as a man by the name of Frank Pease. She has also, in her organization, worked very closely with Donald Shea. I have a photograph of Mr. Shea that I will introduce shortly.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you already introduced it?

Mr. METCALFE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You may introduce the photograph later on. It shows him in the middle of a group of Black Shirts.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Dressed in the uniform of the Black Shirts.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. He was anxious to testify.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; he has been here all the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any pamphlets of this organization?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. Miss Washburn was also active with Clark in creating the Liberty Party at Tacoma, Wash. I have considerable correspondence in the committee files between Mrs. Washburn and Clark, and also with Elizabeth Dilling, the author of Red Network. She is very much adored by all of these organizations because of her anti-Communist stand.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a letter from the American Gentile Protective Association, dated November 8, 1937, as follows:

FRIEND GENTILE: The national crisis is rapidly coming to a head. The finals are about to be enacted. Many will never know what it is all about—others are exceedingly anxious to learn.

Impeachment will burst on the next session of Congress. There are so many grounds for impeachment in this dizzy maze that you may wonder which one. These charges are based on high treason, along the lines (yet boring deeper) of the charges brought by that noble statesman back in 1933 and 1934, the late Congressman Louis T. McFadden of Pennsylvania who, for his wisdom, chivalry, and bravery fighting in our cause, was "railroaded" from office by the gang, then poisoned to get him out of the way by the usual method of silencing.

If it can possibly be arranged in time, this association will sponsor a lecture on the evening of November 18 by one of our outstanding national leaders who is not a politician, officeholder, or office seeker, but who is seeking the emancipation of the Christians from political and financial bondage. His message will be most startling in its disclosures—almost unbelievable, yet true.

You probably have paid as much as \$5 a ticket for lectures of much less consequence; but since ours is a nonprofit association and our desire is to serve, we hope to raise the necessary expenses for this program by making a charge of only 35 cents per ticket, or three for \$1, that none shall be barred on account of finances.

On the response to this preliminary announcement will depend the size of hall to be engaged; and since time is of the essence with only a week in which to make all the arrangements, will you kindly answer by return mail and let us know your willingness to cooperate? The enclosed pledge card is for this purpose.

At the same time, you may wish to aid the cause by writing your own donation receipt. To establish a Christian Commonwealth as we plan will require tons of literature and correspondence, all of which takes money for labor and even postage. Your generosity, therefore, will be appreciated for whatever amount you contribute. This is your last chance to help save America; 1940 will be too late.

Courteously,

LOIS DE LAFAYETTE WASHBURN.

I think that illustrates the character of the organization.

What about the American Gentile Youth Movement? Tell us something about that organization.

Mr. METCALFE. We have some literature on that. That is the organization which has been distributing these stickers all over the country, not in just one city.

The CHAIRMAN. This organization has been distributing stickers over all the sections of the country. I will read this sticker so it will go in the record. The Chair has received this sticker from various sections of the country. It has been pasted on the windows of Jewish business houses. This sticker reads:

Hitler failed—

He let them live. * * * To have peace and prosperity forever each nation must kill his own Jews.

When the last hour for the Jew in America strikes, there will be no passover!

Jews, America is your last mile!

Issued by

AMERICAN GENTILE YOUTH MOVEMENT

Where do most of these appear?

Mr. METCALFE. This came from New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the American Guard, of Chicago, Ill.?

Mr. METCALFE. This organization is the American Guard, and there is another organization known as the American Guards.

The CHAIRMAN. They have more than one member.

Mr. METCALFE. They have the Swastika.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a letter of the American Guard, with the swastika appearing on the letterhead. This address is given as P. O. Box 491, Chicago, Ill., August 2, 1938. It is addressed to Miss Lecia Paas, Box 244, Winnetka, Ill. The letter reads as follows:

Re the last paragraph of my dispatch No. 8.

The information in the paragraph mentioned above was furnished me by a person who in the past has done quite a bit of investigation work in my behalf, and result of that work has always been satisfactory. I never had an opportunity to question the accuracy of his reports. That he in your case apparently made a mistake is, of course, regrettable.

Publication of a retraction is unnecessary as long as Mr. Goerner has busied himself with that.

I don't know whether or not you enlisted the help of Mr. G. or if he issued that warning on his own account. If you really want somebody to vouch for you, you should choose one whose word carries weight. Mr. G. showed exceedingly bad judgment once by being connected with the National Committee Against Communism (headed by one Mr. Smythe), and I therefore don't pay any attention to his assertions.

Because of the error concerning your identity, you wrote something about the dangers of creating strife. And then you went right ahead in your last letter and indicated that, as long as I have thrown suspicion upon you, you and Mrs. Washburn and the rest of the ladies of the National Liberty Party might look upon me in the same way. My dear lady, it is wholly immaterial to me if you think I am a stooge for the Jews or perhaps even a Jew—it won't bother me a bit; in fact I am going to help you broadcast that by sending copies of this letter to all those who received dispatch No. 8. Before you complain about strife, be sure that you don't commit the same blunder.

You wrote about a secret meeting to be held in Chicago soon, but you did not mention the time nor the place—that will be given only to trustworthy persons. Thanks for the compliment.

The coming struggle here in America will, I believe, be fought not with ballots but with bullets, and ladies should therefore stay out of it; it is a man's struggle and not a ladies' picnic, a struggle wherein ladies will be of value only as spies.

This concludes my correspondence.

Yours truly,

OLOV E. TIETZOW.

Mr. METCALFE. He operates between Chicago and Buffalo, according to our information.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he a Russian?

Mr. METCALFE. Apparently. I do not know him personally.

The CHAIRMAN. The next is the American Guards, of Chicago, Ill. Here is a pamphlet issued by that organization entitled "The Voice of True Americans." It reads:

An organization of American-born and naturalized citizens to guard and protect our country from any form dictatorship and to guard and help strengthen our immigration laws and restrictions against the entry into this country of foreign refugees and exiles.

Hitler says "Get out."

With 13,000,000 of our own people out of work—millions on relief—with billions of taxpayers' money being spent to relieve the suffering of our own people, is it wise for our Government to invite and assist these exiles to come to this country?

It says further:

There are approximately 16,000,000 Jews in the world—4,500,000 or more in the United States. From all reports, our foreign embassies are literally

swamped with applications for permission to enter this country. A big percentage Jews.

The American Guards are each contributing 25 cents (no more) to help finance this enrollment. Millions of guards must be enrolled quickly.

Wanted—Patriotic workers and organizers are liberally paid to enroll guards. Men, women, boys, and girls (old and young) are invited to see the district guard.

Then it gives the membership.

Did you check that organization?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. This organization was distributing a secret ballot, and the distributor was getting 15 cents out of each 25 cents that he collected.

The CHAIRMAN. It was a racket organization?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. They kept no books and no records, although they were chartered.

There is another American Guards, a student group, in New York City, but that organization is not checked as yet. We have no literature.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the American Guardsmen?

Mr. METCALFE. We have not checked this organization, nor do we have literature on it, but our information is that they are associated with the American National Socialist Party, and we have literature on that group. That is the only information we have.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the American Italian Union, of St. Louis, Mo.?

Mr. METCALFE. We have not checked that organization, and we have no literature.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the American League, New York, N. Y.?

Mr. METCALFE. We have not checked that organization as yet.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the American League of Christian Women, Los Angeles, California?

Mr. METCALFE. That group we have not checked, either, but their propaganda has been found in the packages from Germany—the propaganda packages that come to the United States from Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the American League of the Friends of the New Germany, Portland, Oreg.? Have you anything on that?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; we have something on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us see that.

Mr. METCALFE. That is a branch of the German-American Bund.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is the head of it; do you have that?

Mr. METCALFE. It is located at Portland, Oreg. That is just about the last place in the country where this group is functioning—the American League. [Handing a paper to the chairman.]

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a pamphlet issued by the American League of the Friends of the New Germany [reading]:

Purpose and aim: To unite all honorable, seriousminded, courageous, and unselfish men and women of the Germanic race, now loyal citizens or residents of the United States, proud of their Germanic blood, and treasuring German traditions, language, and ideals of national and individual liberty, justice, truth, duty, and absolute honesty, into one great, free, proud, and respect-demanding American League of Friends of the New Germany for the mutual benefit of the United States of America and Germany.

Mr. METCALFE. You see when the German-American Bund puts out a pamphlet setting forth its principles, it sounds very beautiful, but behind it is something entirely different.

This organization, you will recall, was before the German-American Bund—the Friends of New Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. We have a lot of evidence on that.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you know about the American National Committee, Chicago, Ill.?

Mr. METCALFE. I think we have something on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you check it?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

This organization is headed by Warren C. Lee, at 8 South Dearborn Street, Chicago. Mr. Lee has had several organizations in his time. He has been prominent in German-American Bund circles. He is a speaker for the German-American Bund, and tours a great deal between Chicago, Alabama, and Florida. He also has an organization known as the National Party of America.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that organization issue anti-Semitic literature?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. He left behind him a trail of phony checks, and the Chicago authorities are looking for him.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the American Labor Party, New York, N. Y.?

Mr. METCALFE. We have considerable literature on this organization, and have checked it. They are located in a little basement at 147 East One Hundred and Sixteenth Street, New York City, and although we have called several times, we have never been able to get them in. They publish several papers. The leader, general manager, and managing editor of the paper also, is Peter H. Stahrenberg, who is very well-known in the circles of the German-American Bund in New York City. They practically work very closely with them. They carry in their bulletin the swastika emblem.

The CHAIRMAN. Here are several bulletins. Here is the National American Bulletin of May 26, 1937, with the swastika emblem on it. It says:

Catholicism, communistic, or nationalistic?—Materialism an American Jewish ideal.—News briefs.—American patriotism dead; communism lives.—Nationalism means self-preservation.

That is one of the pamphlets.

The other pamphlet is dated June 23, 1937, with the swastika emblem on it. It says:

Independence Day, July Fourth.—Hail America! First Russia, then Spain. Is America next?

Here we have the National Socialist Party, New York, N. Y. Are they practically run by the same group?

Mr. METCALFE. It is the same thing, I believe, Congressman.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, there is a difference, because the American National Socialist Party does not have the swastika on its publication, but has the American flag.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; but it is headed by the same man, Peter Stahrenberg, and it is very similar to the American National Labor Party.

The CHAIRMAN. In one he puts the swastika?

Mr. METCALFE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And in the other he puts the American flag. They catch them coming and going.

Here is a publication issued in April 1938:

JEWISH RHYME

The poet laureates of the American (Red) Student Union evidently let their accents get in the way when composing ditties.

"If you wear cotton,
"Japan gets nothing."

It doesn't rhyme in English, but the addition of a Jewish accent will produce the correct rhythmic effect.

There are a great many antisemitic articles in this publication. I do not know that it is necessary to read them. I would like to read some excerpts so that the record will show the character of publication it is. [Reading:]

AMERICANS FACE REVOLUTION

With this wondering humanitarianism spreading hither and yon among our great leaders in world history for idiocracy, the American people have resigned themselves to wondering. Wondering what tomorrow has in store for them. Will we still have a job when we report for work in the morning or will there be some oily refugee leering at us from behind our own work bench?

If the worst should come and relief is our last resort, would a similar personage be doling out charity with such a great display of humanitarianism?

Lowell Thomas recently told the means with which the officials of a Pennsylvania city hall dealt with the family which staged a sit-down strike in the city hall of that city.

* * * * *

And for those Americans who still hope for a peaceful solution, will their desires for a common sense nationalistic government be answered? The reawakening of the traditions, ideals, and spirit instilled into us by our forefathers and which formed the basis of a nationalistic government, will they take place soon enough so that our country and our people may be spared the throes of a bloody revolution?

That gives an idea about this organization.

Here are some more publications issued by this same organization. Here is the National American Bulletin. [Reading:]

Christian Americans! Join hands with us! American National Labor Party.

Oh, this is that labor party.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (reading):

Hitler: Savior of Catholicism. Hitler abolished the classes. Samuel "Underminer" again. Nazi Germany is the enemy of civilization. Refuse to trade with the enemy. * * * that is Samuel "Underminer"!

I think we have enough on this outfit. This is practically the same type of antisemitic literature that the others have.

Here is the National American Bulletin, October 27, 1937. It has the swatiska on the front page. I need not read from it, because that swatiska tells just what it preaches.

You have already dealt with the American Nationalist Federation at St. Albans, W. Va.?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you deal with the American Nationalist Party, Los Angeles, Calif.?

Mr. METCALFE. No, sir. We have literature. [Handing a paper to the chairman.] We have not been out there.

The CHAIRMAN. At the bottom of this paper, which is entitled "A Proclamation," will be found the following words:

In every way, and wherever possible, to show an exclusive preference for gentile merchants, gentile professional men, and gentile working people.

BUY GENTILE! EMPLOY GENTILE! VOTE GENTILE!

Your dime spent at the movies may endorse and support further Jewish attacks upon our Christian morality. To the Jews, that algebraic symbol "X" in their "Xmas sales" means "the unknown."

Issued by the American Nationalist Party for Nation-wide distribution.

I will not read all of it, but the excerpt shows what it is.

Who edits that publication?

Mr. METCALFE. It is just put out by the general headquarters at Los Angeles of the American Nationalist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know who the head of that is?

Mr. METCALFE. No; we do not have that.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the American Nationalists, Inc., Washington, D. C.? Do you have anything on them?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; we have some literature.

The head of that organization is Dudley P. Gilbert; and all we have is the preamble to the constitution of the American Nationalists.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any antisemitic or antireligious literature?

Mr. METCALFE. Gilbert is another man who is prominent in these circles. We have not checked that yet.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; we will pass on then.

What about the American Patriots, Inc., Greenwich, Conn.? Do you know anything about them?

Mr. METCALFE. This organization is headed by Charles L. K. Smith and his Committee of One Million. We have no literature, however, nor have we checked the organization as to its functions.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, if we do not have anything about the organization—I mean, if we do not have something showing that it is antisemitic or antireligious, we will strike that from the record. We do not want to include here any organization on which we do not have some evidence they are engaged in some sort of activity that may be classified as un-American.

Mr. METCALFE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have anything on the American Patriots Association, Inc.?

Mr. METCALFE. No; that has not been checked.

The CHAIRMAN. The American Protective League, Chicago, Ill.?

Mr. METCALFE. No; not checked.

The CHAIRMAN. The American Women, Inc., Los Angeles?

Mr. METCALFE. Not checked.

The CHAIRMAN. American Rangers, Chicago, Ill.?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; we have something on that.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; we will consider that.

Mr. METCALFE. This organization is headed by Edwin Paul Richter. He has, in addition to the American Rangers, an organization known as the American Consumers' Mutual Association, the World War Gratuities Bureau, Washington's Bodyguards, and another one known as the Builders of Business Brotherhood.

Richter is listed by the Chicago Better Business Bureau as a racketeer. He has on that list some 30 different organizations, and he has been active in Detroit as well as Chicago, and also in Cleveland, Ohio.

In Chicago, on one occasion, Richter and his American Rangers attempted to take over the One Hundred and Thirty-second National Guard Armory. That was in May of this year. He wanted to use the armory to drill his troops under the guise of preparing for a Memorial Day parade, whereas actually he simply wanted it to have the stuff there and drill his troops and impress his following with the fact that he was able to obtain the armories. But before he got under way even, as to starting his drills, and so forth—these were uniformed rangers——

The CHAIRMAN. How many rangers did he have?

Mr. METCALFE. He had quite a troop.

The CHAIRMAN. About how many, would you say?

Mr. METCALFE. Fifty to a hundred. And the military intelligence—I was acting as a newspaper reporter at the time; we had a tip on it—and together, the two of us, ran him out of the armory, and in fact we actually chased him down the streets, taking pictures, and so forth, of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you got any of the literature?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes. There followed an investigation by Governor Horner of Illinois, by the Department of Justice, and also by the War Department. Here is some literature on it.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean his literature.

Mr. METCALFE. He has all sorts of literature that he has put out.

The CHAIRMAN. He disseminates quite a bit of literature?

Mr. METCALFE. He at one time had a civil air corps—a so-called civil air corps—and apparently duped a lot of high-school boys into taking courses in aviation, and was exposed. There were no such courses at all after he had collected the tuitions.

On another occasion he staged a beauty contest in connection with the Cleveland Air Show, and there was no beauty contest, and no Mr. Richter, and the funds were gone.

These are all records in the Better Business Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any anti-Semitic or antireligious literature?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. He meets in Turner Hall with the German-American Bund troops, and he has been a speaker before the German-American Bund. He is very well known to them. For instance, Peter Gissibl, who testified here on the opening day of the hearings last August 12, knows him very well, and told me that he had been active in the bund circles.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a letter from Richter. He is the head of that organization, is he?

Mr. METCALFE. The founders of these organizations, it seems, are always dead, so that we cannot go to them and ask them whether they actually had anything to do with the founding of the organization.

The CHAIRMAN. He is the head of the American Rangers?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a letter [reading]:

MY DEAR BROTHER LAUTERBACH: I regret to advise that under our brotherhood code of fidelity—a confidential report—places you temporarily in suspension of membership privileges and official status.

For reason: "Suspicion of allowing confidential information to leak, or using it contrary to the code," and also technical violation of the "conduct of an officer of the brotherhood."

Under article 79 the judge advocate general had to issue the order—and as I feel that my great confidence in your honesty should be justified, am writing this personal note conveying the official information, so that an open published notice is eliminated.

You will be notified within 10 days or 2 weeks for trial when the review board can arrange to call you. Written notice will come, or it may be set for the same date as a meeting—and then at an earlier or later date.

I advise—that under the circumstances—until we can get this cleared up, you show the right spirit as a gentleman and officer, and be absent Tuesday December 10, and until notified.

Chances are that trial court will be convened about 9:45 p. m., December 17, but I cannot say positively until I hear from Judge Hedler.

There were particularly two reported on this charge with possibly a third, and their cases will also be handled with the same spirit of fair dealing and upholding the honor and fidelity—under our solemn oath. You headed the list, and I am, making a personal check up because you are a friend of mine and am sure you would not abuse my great confidence in you, or try to persuade anyone else to by hypnotizing by your winning ways to make perjurers out of themselves and try to doublecross the order and all of us. Orders are "Stand by."

Faternally yours,

E. P. RICHTER, *General Commander.*

Countersigned by some other official.

Mr. METCALFE. He is often seen on the streets in khaki uniform, Army uniform, and a campaign hat, and he wears a large green ribbon around that hat; and one humorous angle of his is his so-called rangers. Everybody—practically everybody—is an officer of some kind. There are hardly any privates.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, let us pass on.

American School for Christian Democracy, Kansas City, Mo. Do you have anything on that?

Mr. METCALFE. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. If you do not have anything on it, we do not want to include it in our discussions.

Mr. METCALFE. No; we have nothing on that organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us pass that organization, then.

Here is the Anti-Communist Society, Philadelphia, Pa.; Anti-Communist League, Philadelphia; Aryan American Citizenship Organization, Philadelphia.

Mr. METCALFE. The Anti-Communist Society and the Anti-Communist League we have checked, and we have literature.

The CHAIRMAN. Who are the heads of those two organizations?

Mr. METCALFE. We have a report of their meetings. It was checked at the hotels, but it was apparently another one of these instances where meetings are being held in hotels without any record being made of the meeting having been held there.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any officers in it?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. We have a rather complete record of it. [Handing a paper to the chairman.]

The CHAIRMAN. What I want to know is about what they are doing. [Reading:]

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Gallagher, the chairman, who asked for reports from the legislative (Miss Starr) committee and from the educational committee (Miss Beurcheet). Miss Starr was not present. Dr. Beurcheet gave a short report on the progress she had been making in disseminating her propaganda throughout the public schools. She asked greater cooperation from the members of the A. C. S. and requested that they give her pamphlets greater city-

wide distribution * * * by placing them on counters in stores, on seats in trolley cars, and any other place where they might come to the attention of the public.

Mr. Zachery, the principal speaker of the evening, was introduced by Mr. Allen. Mr. Zachery described himself as a member of the "Silver Legion" and stated that he was speaking as a member of the legion.

He is the same Zachery that we have heard of before?

Mr. METCALFE. That is Roy Zachery, field marshal of the Silver Shirts.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing):

He then went into a discussion of the "behind-the-scenes manipulations" of the Jewish people to gain control of the United States. He said that all the policies of the New Deal were planned and outlined long before Roosevelt was elected by a Jewish congress in Geneva, Switzerland, at which two Americans had presided. He referred to these Americans as being "alien non-Christians." He went on to say that these two Americans had chosen Roosevelt as the Democratic candidate long before the Democratic convention because of his friendliness toward the Jewish people.

I think that is enough to read on that organization.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the Anti-Communism Society of Philadelphia, Pa., and the Anti-Communitic League of Philadelphia?

Mr. METCALFE. That is practically the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the German-American Citizenship Organization.

Mr. METCALFE. We have nothing on that.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the American White Guard, of Los Angeles, Calif.?

Mr. METCALFE. On the American White Guard, we have literature and letters, and the director of it is Henry Allen, who has organized several pro-Fascist groups on the west coast.

The CHAIRMAN. When you say pro-Fascist, you mean anti-Semitic?

Mr. METCALFE. And pro-Nazi.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by pro-Nazi, that they openly profess belief in naziism?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you have on this organization, as an illustration of that?

Mr. METCALFE. Henry Allen has been referred to several times in previous testimony. He is a man who has behind him a long record of convictions, forgeries, and so forth, and he is under trial at the present time.

He is a liaison man between the Silver Shirts in California and the Gold Shirts in Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is enough.

Mr. METCALFE. We have his own letter, under his own signature.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us see that [referring to letter produced by Mr. Metcalfe.]

Here is a letter dated July 31, 1937, on the letterhead of "American White Guard, Division Headquarters, Los Angeles, California, U. S. A.," signed by Henry Allen. In this letter he says:

You say that some people blame the Fascists, and some blame the Jews and Communists for the universal world bedlam of today. May I inform you that, reduced to its final analysis, Fascism, in reality, is nothing but anti-Jewism. From this, you may understand that until we totally eliminate these oriental mongrels from our national life, and until there is a purging of the whole world which has become bastardized by this swine of the Ghettos, we may suffer our-

selves, here in the United States, to be herded like cattle as in Spain, as in Russia, before the Jewish commissars who will now come into power with the passage today of the Roosevelt-Jew-Communist wage-and-hour bill.

The American White Guard gives solemn warning to the international goulash of oriental scum which today permeates our Government in Washington. Let those who dare attempt to betray America, and there will be more Jew corpses cluttering up American gutters than ever were found in the most ambitious of European pogroms. That shall be our answer to those who seek to bring our American Republic under the rule of the Kremlin.

I might suggest that the Pelley Publishers at Asheville, N. C., P. O. Box 2630, publish the Jewish Protocols, and they also have much other valuable literature for sale. The magazine *New Liberation* is a magnificent publication of educational worth.

Mr. METCALFE. That is the Silver Shirts.

The CHAIRMAN. It is signed, "Very truly yours, Henry Allen."

What about the Black Legion of Detroit? Is it defunct?

Mr. METCALFE. It is believed that remnants of the organization are still functioning in the Great Lakes Region.

The CHAIRMAN. Believed by whom? That is rather indefinite.

Mr. METCALFE. By reports we have, and complaints. We have no proof; we have not been able to go out there and check up.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a well-known pro-Fascist organization?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about the Black Shirts of Tacoma, Wash.?

Mr. METCALFE. We have a great deal of correspondence.

Mr. MASON. Are the Black Shirts of Tacoma, Wash., the same as the Black Shirts of other cities?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes. One of the figures in this organization is Donald Shea, who was referred to, and Mrs. Washburn; also Frank Clark, referred to in letters by Shea, written to each other, and in that photograph Shea is standing with the Black Shirts; and we have the Black Shirts organization in this group; and we also have a picture of Frank Clark.

The CHAIRMAN. This is an anti-Semitic organization. Their literature—their papers and pamphlets all are along that line.

As a result of your investigation of these organizations, to what extent would you say these organizations are rackets and to what extent are they bona fide?

Mr. METCALFE. Well, I would say perhaps 25 percent are bona fide, and probably 75 percent are pure rackets.

The CHAIRMAN. Seventy-five percent are pure rackets?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a list of about 135 here?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Does your investigation show how these organizations live, or do they pay their way through contributions?

Mr. METCALFE. By contributions—they raise money in different ways, by the sale of literature.

The CHAIRMAN. Since they have refused to submit their lists of contributors, you have no definite information as to who these contributors are?

Mr. METCALFE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. They have refused to surrender to you such lists?

Mr. METCALFE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. To what extent are these organizations distributing antiracial or antireligious propaganda throughout the country?

Mr. METCALFE. Well, I would say they are all very active in that particular thing. That seems to be one of the main motives of these organizations, to spread antiracial and antireligious propaganda, and to stir up trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. To stir up hatred among people?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; to stir up hatred among people.

The CHAIRMAN. Does your investigation disclose whether or not this literature has wide distribution throughout the country?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; I have picked them up all over the country.

For instance, we will pick up a piece of literature in New York and identically the same kind of literature in the headquarters of the German-American Bund in Los Angeles.

The CHAIRMAN. Does your investigation indicate whether or not the Silver Shirt organization is growing?

Mr. METCALFE. I believe they are growing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is their magazine, "Liberation," receiving wide distribution throughout the country?

Mr. METCALFE. I do not believe, for instance, that the Silver Shirt organization is growing to an alarming extent; its distribution of literature and its publication of "Liberation" magazine, I do not believe exceeds 5,000 copies.

However, they have hundreds of thousands of pamphlets that they print in Asheville, N. C., and these are shipped all over the country. So, in addition to the magazine, they have many little pamphlets or leaflets, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. Are other organizations distributing the pamphlets and literature of the Silver Shirts?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; we show that through the correspondence, copies of which are here, where they pick them up, or they tell some one to write and get it. In one of the letters you read, there is a direction to Mrs. Washburn to take some of the literature and distribute it.

The CHAIRMAN. What does your investigation disclose with reference to the membership in these organizations, whether or not there is a large membership, or any membership, outside of the person who is conducting it?

Mr. METCALFE. Many of the organizations that we have classified as rackets are simply letterhead organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. They have no members?

Mr. METCALFE. They have practically no members. They do, however, have members here and there, but practically none to speak of in volume, however. They distribute literature and sell that literature, or have subscribers to that literature or to their bulletins, and in that way they get money.

A lot of propaganda is in the form of whispering campaigns against legitimate merchants in various large cities, particularly.

I might say this, and it will be borne out by the evidence here, that this wave of anti-Semitism and these religious attacks appear chiefly in the larger cities of the United States, not so much in the countryside.

The German-American Bund, for instance, which is one of the most powerful groups functioning along these same lines, has tried again and again to get this movement organized in the South, and it has failed. The southern people would not take to it.

On the other hand, Pelley has some strength in West Virginia. Pelley moves all over the United States, even though his headquarters are in Asheville, N. C. He has his headquarters there, but his strength is not there. In fact, I discovered, when going to Asheville, that the people hardly knew the man, but he was quite well known in New York, in Boston, in Chicago, in Pittsburgh, in Philadelphia, in Washington, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. Does your investigation disclose that there is a rising tide of anti-Semitism and of antireligious propaganda in the United States?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; I would say there is definitely a rising tide of that character.

The CHAIRMAN. To what extent would you say this increasing racial and religious intolerance is due to the distribution of these pamphlets and other literature, and to what extent is it due to what is occurring in Europe: That is calling for an opinion.

Mr. METCALFE. With an increase of this literature, naturally, it would be logical to assume that some of the increase in the anti-Semitic wave or antireligious wave could be attributed to this growing amount of literature. At the same time, judging from the conversations with various of the leaders around the country, these very leaders of these organizations, it appears very clear that the situation in Europe is having a decided effect in America.

In other words, it is already a known fact that a number of these organizations work in close cooperation with the propaganda agencies of the German Government or the Italian Government. That we have shown.

The CHAIRMAN. Our evidence bears that out.

Mr. METCALFE. So I should say in all probability it would have an effect here.

The CHAIRMAN. In what sections of the country did you find, in your investigation, that this rising tide of antiracial and religious feeling is more pronounced?

Mr. METCALFE. Rather than say it is more pronounced in any particular section of the country, I would say it is more pronounced in the larger cities all over the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Particularly in New York?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the Middle West?

Mr. METCALFE. In Chicago, in Wisconsin, and on the coast.

Mr. MASON. In these large cities, where it is so prevalent, you find these racial groups that have not been amalgamated are so outstanding that there is where it would have affected them, and that is fertile soil. Here are the Nazi and other groups segregated in the large cities and there are often clashes between them.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very wise observation.

Mr. METCALFE. For instance, we find this condition, that perhaps Congressman Mason is familiar with. In Indiana, Michigan, and Illinois, and in Wisconsin, in the countryside, there is a very strong wave of anti-semitism and of boycott. For instance, it is very difficult for Jewish people to patronize certain resorts, particularly in Wisconsin and Michigan. These people who own these resorts, or who operate them, refuse to let Jewish people use these resorts, which

is definitely an un-American activity. They refuse to serve them in restaurants.

We have had that sort of reports from Michigan, Wisconsin, and Indiana, and I believe Congressman Mason knows about those conditions existing in those areas where there are parks and things of that kind privately owned.

The CHAIRMAN. The reason I was inquiring into it was because there have come to the Chair various reports of anti-Semitism in the United States, and I have felt from the beginning that some recognition should be given to that fact and it should be dragged into the open.

Mr. MASON. It has been fomented by all this literature that has been sent out.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has been flooded with these pamphlets and stickers from various parts of the country, from small towns and the countryside in every section, and I do not believe there has been an exception as to the section from which it came.

Some one is paying for it. This is bound to cost a considerable sum of money.

Mr. METCALFE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. We do not know how much is coming direct from Germany. We know some of it is, because we have evidence of that.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. But the larger portion of it is evidently coming from within the United States. We have no evidence that all this propaganda is coming from abroad.

Mr. METCALFE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. While we do not know who is paying for it, nevertheless, from the evidence before us in the form of such an avalanche of this propaganda, it is evident that someone is paying for it.

Many of these organizations do not have books.

Mr. METCALFE. They have no books, records, or no bank accounts and in many cases there is nothing that can be checked, and yet they have money. They are getting money to print the literature.

The CHAIRMAN. They are using corporate protection, the right to take out a charter, and hide behind that charter for the purpose of collecting large sums of money and disseminating this antiracial and antireligious propaganda, and yet they are not required to make any accounting. And when you approach them you say they tell you they have no books.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And no records at all.

Mr. METCALFE. That is right.

Mr. MASON. Is not that a violation of the law? If they are incorporated, do they not have to make a report each year?

Mr. METCALFE. Under the State charters, I believe they are supposed to, but they say they have not yet just gotten around to it.

Mr. MASON. It seems to me it is essential that this committee should get across to the public, through the newspapers, if possible, that at least 75 percent, or perhaps a larger amount of these organizations getting out this stuff are nothing but rackets, preying upon the credulity of the people who pay dues of 25 cents or 35 cents, and that is what is causing trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. Surely it is.

For instance, there are two pamphlets; one has the name of Louis Basky on it, one being in pink and the other in blue. People are sending this stuff in from various parts of the country. One of these is published in Chicago and one in New York.

Mr. METCALFE. This again shows, Congressman, that apparently a lot of this literature is coming from some one source. There is a uniform source operating in this country that is spreading this material, because here is a perfect example, the same type of literature is appearing at the same time in two different cities.

The CHAIRMAN. Both with the heading "Revolt."

Mr. METCALFE. That is one of a number of instances that can be shown.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently, Basky is dead, because it says here, "Our brave Comrade, Basky, is dead."

Mr. MASON. And the American public swallow that stuff.

The CHAIRMAN. This committee does not have the time or the funds to allow it to undertake to trace down the source of this material, or how an attempt is being made to distribute this material, and yet it is evidently being distributed on a wide-scale plan.

Mr. MASON. And as a pure racket it is subject to the law, is it not? A violation of the corporation law is subject to penalty under the law, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. Why could we not take up with the secretary of state in each State in which these organizations exist, what we have found out through your evidence, and advise the secretary of state and the attorney general of each State that these organizations have stated to you that they have no books and that they refuse to show who their contributors are, and call upon the attorney general in each State to enforce the law, and if they have no such law, suggest to the States some type of law that would prevent this kind of pernicious racketeering being carried on all over the country.

Mr. MASON. I think that is a very constructive suggestion, and I am quite sure that practically all of the States have corporation laws that provide that when a corporation is formed under the laws of the State they must make a yearly report to the secretary of state.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose the Chair announces that he will write to the appropriate authorities in each State and call attention to the existence of these organizations, chartered under the laws of that State, and call attention to the fact that these organizations have not complied with the law, and request that they be required to comply with the law, or else that they be dissolved, to the end that the American people will be protected against what is happening everywhere.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Chairman, there is one important point that has made itself evident in this investigation of many of these organizations. That is this.

The postmasters in practically every city I went to are unanimous in the belief that there is urgent need for some sort of a Federal law that prohibits the use of United States mails for antiracial or antireligious or anti-Government propaganda, that is, propaganda which would tend to the overthrow of the Government, revolutionary propaganda.

The United States mails, they point out, are helpless at the present time. They have to deliver all this material which they know is absolutely un-American and some times subversive.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, that brings up a serious question, and there is one way you can handle it without doing that. If we can devise some legislation requiring these organizations to make semi-annual reports to some central agency, reporting a list of their contributors and how much money they get and what they do with that money, that will be one way to do it.

Throught the spotlight of publicity thrown upon them, 75 percent of these organizations will go out of existence automatically. They move in darkness and they do their work underground, and when you bring them into the surface they will go out of existence without the necessity for any drastic legislation.

The public hearings of the committee will stand adjourned until Monday morning at 10:30 o'clock.

(Thereupon, the subcommittee adjourned to meet Monday, November 21, 1938, at 10:30 a. m.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1938

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES.
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

We have a meeting this afternoon at 1:30. We have two witnesses from New York who will testify, and then tomorrow we have a very important witness. We will probably run all the week from the way things look now.

Before we start this testimony, on Saturday the Chair called attention to certain additional statements made by Mr. Saposs in the Labor Age, and an effort has been made to create the impression that Mr. Saposs was not expressing his own opinion. Here is the article in full, which the chairman will order printed in the proceedings of this committee.

I will read some of it to show that no other interpretation could be put upon it, except the interpretation that we have placed on it.

I am reading now from Left Opposition, in the Labor and Socialist International, by D. J. Saposs:

A small minority in the Fourth Congress of the Labor and Socialist International held in Vienna from July 4-August 1, led by the British Independent Labor Party, took issue with the overwhelming majority. The differences were not so much over fundamental principles as over the mode of procedure. The minority demanded more positive, energetic, and uncompromising action in the attempt of the socialists to cope with the present world ailments. Its spokesmen maintained that economic conditions are ripe for socialism, and that the International should therefore direct its forces for the immediate overthrow of capitalism. Instead of taking this positive position the majority favors temporizing.

Here follows Mr. Saposs' statement—

This is a fallacious attitude; the Socialist movement must tell the people that capitalism cannot be stabilized and that the world cannot be saved by capitalist devices.

That is by Mr. Saposs. It is not a quotation from anyone else. That was the attitude of the minority and majority in the convention, and this is his own editorial statement:

This is a fallacious attitude; the Socialist movement must tell the people that capitalism cannot be stabilized and that the world cannot be saved by capitalist devices.

I do not see any necessity of reading all of it.

I might say that in the book, *Left Wing Unionism*, there appears a statement of a similar nature, not made as a statement coming from anyone else, as quoting anyone else, or based upon any information given by someone else, but they are direct comments of the man himself.

The reason I emphasize this is because Mr. Saposs is a symbol or is an illustration of a number of Government employees. Many economic crackpots have been drawn to Washington, ranging all the way from outright Socialists to Communists, and this committee, within the limited time left to it, will undertake to expose as many of those people as possible, because it is the opinion of the Chair, and I am sure it is shared by a majority of the committee, that no Government official has the right to live on the taxpayers' money contributed by patriotic people of America, when he does not believe in the Government he is working for.

This committee heard testimony from Government employees Saturday afternoon in executive session, which revealed what I would term a very alarming situation. Those Government employees do not want their names made public, but they were heard in executive session, under oath, and their testimony was reduced to writing. It shows that some officials are carrying out the philosophy of men like Mr. Saposs in the Government, who make class hatred their primary tactics. In other words, that seems to be the principle or the motivating force, or whatever you might call it, behind all their activities.

MR. MASON. Making the class struggle the basis of their operations.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; they use Government machinery and Government publications for that purpose. We received absolute evidence on Saturday of the deliberate use of Government publications for the purpose of promoting and stirring up class hatred in the United States, using well-known Communist phraseology in certain Government publications which are disseminated throughout the United States.

I do not know how far this committee will be able to go into it, but we will undertake during the limited time at our disposal to reveal that many of these people through their writings and activities show their connections with or their membership in front organizations of the Communist Party.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN C. METCALFE—Resumed

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Metcalfe, how many organizations did we take up on Saturday?

MR. METCALFE. Forty-six.

The CHAIRMAN. All of those organizations that we took up on Saturday are disseminating religious and racial hatred, are they not?

MR. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Which is just as bad as class hatred.

MR. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the Black Shirts, of Union City, N. J.?

MR. METCALFE. That is the same organization that was marching with the German-American Bund at Camp Siegfried and also at Camp Nordland.

The CHAIRMAN. It is all based on intolerance and religious hatred.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the Blue Coats, Inc., of Long Beach, Calif.?

Mr. METCALFE. We have no direct evidence on that organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any pamphlets issued by the Blue Coats?

Mr. METCALFE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have something with reference to all of these organizations listed under the name "Christian," such as the Christian American Crusade, Los Angeles, Calif.; the Christian American Patriots; the Christian Campaign Committee; the Christian Constitutionalist Party, San Francisco, Calif.; Christian Democrats (Democratic Corporation), Dallas, Tex.; The Christian Commonwealth League; the Christian Party, Tacoma, Wash.; the Christian Protective League, Mobile, Ala., and the Christian Protestant Party.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. What I might do, Mr. Chairman, is to go through these envelopes which contain the documents and literature.

The CHAIRMAN. I have this list right here before me. Do you have anything on this group of organizations?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us go through them. They are evidently under one control.

Mr. METCALFE. No, sir; they are different groups.

Mr. MASON. They are capitalizing on the word "Christian."

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. There is a common practice of misusing the words "American," "Patriotic," "Christian," "Defenders," and words of that kind in these organizations. That is to mislead the public as to the true principles of those organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to get something as to these so-called Christian organizations, or organizations that use the word "Christian." What Christianity has to do with religious hatred, I do not know.

Mr. MASON. It is the opposite of racial or class prejudice. It is contrary to Christ's teachings.

The CHAIRMAN. We find that many of those who are talking the loudest about racial and religious hatred are silent on the subject when it comes to class hatred.

Mr. METCALFE. Here is the folder on the Anti-Communist Federation of America, of Los Angeles. This literature speaks for itself.

The CHAIRMAN. This poster reads as follows:

CHRISTIAN VIGILANTES ARISE!—BUY GENTILE.—EMPLOY GENTILE.—VOTE GENTILE

HOLLYWOOD

Boycott the movies!—Hollywood is the Sodum and Gomorrha where International Jewry controls Vice—Dope—Gambling—where young Gentile girls are raped by Jewish producers, directors, casting directors who go unpunished

The Jewish Hollywood Anti-Nazi League controls communism in the motion-picture industry—Stars, writers, and artists are compelled to pay for communist activities

ANTI-COMMUNIST FEDERATION OF AMERICA

Do you know who is running this outfit?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; we have some information on that. These circulars are being distributed through the German-American Bund at Los Angeles.

The CHAIRMAN. What is next?

Mr. METCALFE. Here is an organization called the Christian American Crusade, of Los Angeles.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a pamphlet issued by the Christian American Crusades reading:

The New Deal: Is it for our liberty or our bondage? Where did it originate? Who administers it? Slaves or sovereigns?

This is by Martin Luther Thomas, founder.

What is this Anti-Democratic?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. They have been identified with the same groups, but they are practically out of existence according to our information.

The CHAIRMAN. I wanted to see if there is anything antiracial or antireligious about it. We do not want anything here that is not definitely un-American for this record. The fact that it is against the New Deal does not make it that way. Have you checked them?

Mr. METCALFE. They are in the same classification with the other groups. They are living alongside with and are acting in cooperation with similar groups.

The CHAIRMAN. You say it is practically out of existence?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, we will not clutter up the record with any more of it.

Mr. METCALFE. The next organization is the American Defenders and the International Legion Against Communism, of Coral Gables, Fla., of which Maj. Frank Pease is the director. I have a letter showing that he moved out of New York City, and is no longer there. He was subpoenaed four years ago by the McCormack Committee for engaging in the same type of activities—antiracial and antireligious. He was heard in executive session at that time. For good reasons he was not heard publicly.

The CHAIRMAN. This circular reads:

Americans, never forget! Who owns what, is "key" to most of your troubles. To accomplish this we demand correction and improvement in a few basic things: The outlawing of communism and its purging from America; the restoration of ownership of important social control institutions to white, gentile, American citizens exclusively; a settlement, for all time, of the color, alien, and mongrel problems by immediate sweeping legislation unequivocally penalizing pollution of white, gentile, American blood; which deports undesirables, unemployed and unassimilable aliens; which stops all further immigration, especially of non-Nordics; which collects war and other foreign-owed debts; which takes command of the North American continent and gives back to white, gentile, American youth its rightful place in the sun—instead of a bunk in a C. C. C. camp.

This program also calls for you, if you are of America's superior class of white, gentile citizens, to join American Defenders and put through this program.

Americans—defend America!

Join American Defenders.

Here is some more literature. I will not encumber the record with much of it. I am trying to put in the record something in regard to each of these organizations that will show the class of propaganda they are putting out. In this article entitled "American Defenders Protective Tactics," paragraph 10 reads as follows:

At all costs protect and preserve your central political power and continuity. Its fall has worse psychological effect than military losses. Eliminate "neutrals" and Jews, and all doubtful races and groups—all who "waver." Keep all such away from your center and from contaminating your troops. Maintain iron discipline, especially in this. (Where communism is concerned, Jews are not trustworthy. There is no "argument" about this; it is a proven historic fact.)

Out of 545 leaders of Bolshevism, 469 were Jews in Russia; with comparable proportions in Hungary, and in Spain today, where the "red" but so-called "Loyalists" central command is in the Soviet Embassy in Madrid under the Jews, Rosenberg and Bela Kun. At this very hour, in Soviet Russia, out of 59 members of the central committee of the Communist Party, 56 are Jews, with the remaining three married to Jewesses. In command of the provincial committees all over Soviet Russia, at this very hour, out of 49 members, 41 are Jews. Thus today, 1937, Soviet Russia, not Palestine, is the promissory land, and Moscow headquarters of the Jewish empire. Moreover, the cut-throat, raping, looting "Lenin Boys" are always Jews wherever communism breaks out. What the Jews call "capitalism," call the "bourgeois world," call the "class struggle," are but masks of the Jewish race war. Jews do not need any protocols; Jews are a protocol. Every Jew is a creeping conspiracy, two Jews are a plot, three Jews gathered together in Israel's name are a revolution. The Jews have always formed a rebellious element in every State, and not more in those where they were persecuted than in those where they were allowed to dwell at peace. (The Secret World Government, by Maj. Gen. Count-Spiridovich, 1926.)

Here is something about the White Knights.

Mr. METCALFE. That organization is the Knights of the White Camellia, of St. Albans, W. Va. The head of that organization is George E. Deatherage.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a magazine called the White Knight. It is "published under authority of the Knights of the White Camellia," and it sets forth a number of Government officials, including Bernard M. Baruch, Cordell Hull, Felix Frankfurter, C. E. Wyzanski, Jr., David J. Sapoos, Isadore Lubin, Leo Wolman, W. I. Myers, W. C. Bullit, Harold Nathan, Louis H. Bean, David E. Lilienthal, Nathan R. Margold, Sydney Hillman, Jacob Baker, Jerome N. Frank, M. S. Eisenhower, E. A. Goldenweiser, David Saperstein, William Alexander Julian, Justice B. N. Cardozo, Benjamin Cohen, Justice Louis D. Brandeis, Donald Richberg, J. D. Wolfsohn, Frances Jurkowitz, Jesse Isador Straus, Mordecai J. B. Ezekiel, Charles Michelson, and Henry Morgenthau, Jr.

Mr. Mason. All Jews?

The CHAIRMAN. All Jews. Under each name is a lot of inflammatory statements, and vicious attacks, based primarily upon the fact that these Jews are connected with the Federal Government. This magazine seems to have a very wide distribution throughout the country, because I have information that it is being sent to many places. It seems to be a rather important publication for the anti-racial group.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Deatherage is the one who is most active in that particular field of activity.

The CHAIRMAN. What is next?

Mr. METCALFE. The next is the American Vigilante Intelligence Federation. Harry A Jung is the director. This organization was also under investigation 4 years ago by the McCormack Committee. It was found at that time to be distributing a great mass of literature.

The CHAIRMAN. The McCormack Committee did not list anything on this organization, did they? There is nothing in the record.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; there is something in the record that I could quote from this particular organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes it would be helpful to have some of this information to go into the record. Nothing can be combatted so successfully as it can be when driven into the open. Here is the printed copy of a letter from the American Vigilante Intelligence Federation, national headquarters, P. O. Box 144, Chicago, Ill. It is signed by Harry A. Jung, and is addressed to Mr. Harry F. Seiber, Treasurer, Silver Legion of America, Asheville, N. C. It reads as follows:

In response to yours addressed to R. L. Peterson, on November 28, we can give you a price of 60 cents per copy in quantity lots of the Protocols.

As for Halt Gentile! and Salute the Jew, same can be had at 10 cents per copy, in quantity lots or 15 cents apiece.

Is there anything else?

Mr. METCALFE. Here is the folder on the Christian Democrats and Christian Democratic Corporation, of Dallas, Tex., and Washington, D. C. The representative in Dallas is C. Buchanan Smith.

The CHAIRMAN. That is down in Texas?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It is just one of the antiracial and antireligious propaganda organizations.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to see what it says. I will pick out this paragraph for the record:

The gold standard was first foisted upon Great Britain by the Rothschilds (international Jewish bankers), and then upon other Christian nations—France, Germany, and the United States—by getting the politicians of those countries (through bribery, coercion, or misrepresentation) to enact laws which demonetized silver and made gold the only lawful money and full legal tender in those countries. These laws reduced the supply of money in those countries and created a monopoly of it for the money brokers who owned or controlled the supply of gold.

And this further paragraph:

Under this Jewish system which we use now, workers cannot win in spite of the splendid efforts of labor unions and their leaders—who are too blind to see that their real enemy is not our Fords, Mellons, Rockefellers, DuPonts, and other great industrialists, but the Jewish system of money and banking which exploits both the industrialists and the workers.

Maybe this blindness on the part of labor leaders is due to the fact that so many Jews are found in key positions of authority in labor unions where they can blind Christian workers to the real cause of their distress.

Mr. METCALFE. I have the Association of American Gentiles, another anti-Jewish organization, and the man's name in the upper right-hand corner is George A. Herold.

The CHAIRMAN. George A. Herold. Where does he live?

Mr. METCALFE. Chicago, Ill.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you call this association?

Mr. METCALFE. The Association of American Gentiles.

The CHAIRMAN (reading) :

Don't Be a Jew!—

I am quoting now—

Don't act like a Jew! Let your conduct be that of a gentile. The characteristics of a gentile are the very opposite to that of the Jew. Be honest and upright in your dealings with your fellow gentiles. Don't do anything that will jeopardize the position or livelihood of a fellow gentile.

You cannot always tell a Jew by the shape of his proboscis. The outward appearance is not the only characteristic that distinguishes the Jew from the gentile. The difference is more fundamental: it is the inherent qualities of character peculiar to the Jewish race that makes a man a Jew, whether born a Jew or gentile.

I will not read any more of that. That is enough to show what it is all about.

Mr. METCALFE. Then we have, of course, the Association of Leagues of Cleveland, Ohio, of which Miss Susan Sterling was the head.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the name of the organization?

Mr. METCALFE. The Association of Leagues. It is a group of different organizations. Miss Susan Sterling, whose real name is Theuer, was the head of that organization, and it has been pretty well broken up as the result of exposés in the Cleveland newspapers.

The CHAIRMAN. It is really not in existence any longer?

Mr. METCALFE. Practically not.

The CHAIRMAN. Then we will not spend any time on it. There are enough of them working without spending time on those that are asleep or dormant.

Mr. METCALFE. I have here a letter of the Christian Party, of Washington—Tacoma, Wash.—which is an affiliate of the Silver Shirts [handing a paper to the chairman].

The CHAIRMAN (reading) :

CHRISTIAN PARTY OF WASHINGTON

PIERCE COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE

329 Provident Building, Tacoma

Above is the Pelley "Christian Party" 1936 letterhead, and with the Masonic-Jew secret "Illuminati" symbols plastered on them. Take a good look again at the copy of the Jew secret symbols. Here is the main reason that the Christian Party was a complete failure in the State of Washington.

When you get word in from Canada and the address I have sent you, you will soon find on two of its pages where it is ripping the Masonic Order all to hell, and they propose to flood all of Canada with 50,000,000 copies.

This seems to be a letter put out by this organization?

Mr. METCALFE. That is right; yes, sir.

In line with this same organization that you raised the question about a few minutes ago, there are organizations under very similar names that are also affiliates of the Silver Shirts, and among these are the Christian American Patriots, the Christian Campaign Committee, the Christian Constitutional Party, the Christian Commonwealth League—you can see the similarity of names—and the Christian Protestant Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have information on those organizations?

Mr. METCALFE. No; except that we know that they are all in this same group, and they all originate from the Silver Shirt movement,

and are foundlings of William Dudley Pelley, who is known to be active in all these groups.

The CHAIRMAN. What is this Committee of Five Hundred, New York, N. Y.? Have you anything on them?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir [handing a paper to the Chairman]. That organization was investigated. This organization meets right at the German-American Bund in New York City, at Manhattan Post.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you interview them?

Mr. METCALFE. No, sir. They sent up word that they were not there. But that is where they meet, and it was verified.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you got any authentic publication put out by this organization?

Mr. METCALFE. By the same men that are behind that, and we will show it in other groups; for example, Kurt Mafick.

The CHAIRMAN. But what we want is something to put in the record; something authentic from them—their own statements showing what they are preaching.

Mr. METCALFE. This is a pro-Nazi organization. As I say, they meet right in the private headquarters of the German-American Bund in Manhattan.

The CHAIRMAN. If you get some literature put out by them, give it to us, so that we can put it in the record.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We want to confine this to the organizations that have, by their own statements, advocated racial or religious hatred. That is what we are trying to do on the Communistic fronts—those organizations which are really advocating class hatred.

Mr. METCALFE. Some of those on the next page have already been visited.

The CHAIRMAN. We can dispose of a large group right here. Take the German groups. I am not speaking of the legitimate German societies, like the Stenben and other that are absolutely patriotic; but what about these? Here is the Friends of the New Germany. We have already touched on them.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; and the German-American Bund; the German-American Business League. We have already had testimony on that.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the German-American Economy Alliance, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. METCALFE. They work in cooperation with the German-American Bund in Chicago.

The CHAIRMAN. What about these Gold Shirts of Mexico? We have had quite a number of letters about them.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes. They are very active.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any of their literature?

Mr. METCALFE. The Naval Intelligence picked up quite a file on the Pacific coast through Henry Allen, who was mentioned yesterday, and we presented a letter under their signature. Representatives of the Gold Shirts of Mexico and leaders of the German-American Bund meet jointly at the headquarters of the German-American Bund in Los Angeles.

This [handing a paper to the chairman] is the Defenders of American Liberty, of Ledyard, Iowa, which speaks for itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a pamphlet put out by the Defenders of American Liberty. It says "Clear Lake, Iowa," and "Ledyard, Iowa." They seem to have two post-office addresses.

They say:

INVISIBLE POWERS

* * * * *

What is this evil influence, this disturbing power?

It is the power exercised by Jewry.

But by whose authority can one make so terrible an accusation? The answer is "By the authority of the leaders of zionism themselves."

These self-accusations or confessions are contained in a work entitled The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, a copy of which was found in the British Museum in 1906, and was catalogued August 10, under number 3926 D, 17. It was published by Sergius Nilus in 1901.

That is enough. That gives the idea.

Mr. METCALFE. This [indicating] is the Defenders, of Wichita, Kans., headed by the Rev. Gerald B. Winrod, a recent candidate for the United States Senate. I think that his activities have been pretty generally publicized.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything here dealing with anti-Semitic or antireligious activities?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; his attacks upon the Catholic Church.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is one article entitled "The Protestant Papacy," by Dr. Gerald B. Winrod.

Mr. METCALFE. He is the man who refers to Pope Pius as "Mr. Pius" constantly.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us see what he has got here.

The Chair received a letter from Dr. Winrod in which he denied that he had preached any anti-semitism and denied that he is sympathetic with fascism. He says he is absolutely opposed to fascism and nazi-ism, and is opposed to racial and religious hatred, and denies that he has disseminated any literature preaching racial or religious hatred. Now, what I want to know is, have you got anything of his in which he has done that?

Mr. METCALFE. I believe you will find it in there.

The CHAIRMAN. I cannot tell what all this is about. I wish you would look at this first.

Mr. METCALFE. You will notice that he is also recommended by the swastika-bearing publications there.

The CHAIRMAN. But you cannot always go by that, because we have had some Communists endorse Democratic and Republican candidates alike. That does not necessarily always mean that the candidates are communistic. I would like to get some excerpt of his where he himself has preached any religious or racial intolerance.

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The Deutscher Konsun Verband, which is the D. K. V. of the German-American Bund, of course is well known, and has been testified to here as to its activities.

I have here literature distributed by Robert Edward Edmondson, who is the director of the Edmondson Economic Service of New York City, and I believe this literature again will make it clear. [Handing papers to the chairman.]

The CHAIRMAN. Here is one of the pamphlets put out by Mr. Edmondson:

CITIZENS! KNOW YOUR POWERS! YOU ARE STRONGER THAN YOU THINK!

Retaining majority-powers, the 48 sovereign Republican States delegated only 18 specific governmental powers to the Federal Central Agency at Washington—for nationalistic purposes.

Jewish legalists have held that the clause of the eighth section of article 1 of the Constitution viz: "To provide for the * * * general welfare of the United States," means the "general welfare" of every citizen in each of all the States—the alien objective being establishment of a communistic centralized dictatorship over the whole country.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Edmondson is the featured speaker of the German-American Bund.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the striking fact about these organizations is, is it not, that growing up in the United States all of them use as their reason for existing, communism, exactly as the Fascist Party has in its program anticommunism. Mussolini used that in Italy as one of the chief reasons why the people ought to embrace fascism, and the same is true in Germany as the reason why they should embrace nazi-ism. So we find that similarity between those movements and what some of these organizations are saying in their literature; is not that the fact?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes. I think I would make this observation: That in studying the literature and in having called on the leaders of various groups, and with this evidence which we have obtained, it becomes increasingly evident that there is a similarity of—

The CHAIRMAN. Ideology?

Mr. METCALFE. The type of propaganda; that is it; that it is coming from some central point in the United States. I mean there is some group in America that is helping to inspire, helping to direct, helping to finance this movement.

The CHAIRMAN. Getting back to this material from which I have been reading, Mr. Edmondson issues a great deal of propaganda, does he not?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; he does.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice here he has the heading: "Roosevelt's Supreme Council. Alien-Asiatic Revolutionaries Control U. S. Political-Economic Power-Centers—Washington and New York."

Then he has in the middle, "Roosevelt Personal Government." Then he has the names: H. Feis, Ben. Cohen, Jerome Frank, Nathan Margold, David E. Lilienthal, Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., Felix Frankfurter (dictator of the New Deal). Then under Bernard M. Baruch ("Unofficial President"), he has Gerard Swope, E. Mandel-House, Mordecai Ezekiel, Newton D. Baker, Adolph J. Sabath, Benjamin N. Cardozo.

Then under Frances Perkins ("Friend of Aliens") he has Leo Wolman, Sidney Hillman, W. M. Leiserson, Isador Lubin, Jr., Frances Jurkowitz, Rose Schneiderman.

This particular pamphlet had wide distribution, did it not?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand it went out all over the country. That is the reason I am placing some of this in the record, so that it will be known what it is.

Then it has Henry Morgenthau ("International Banker"), R. S. Hecht, Jacob Viner, David Stern, B. G. Richards, Herman Oliphant, E. W. Goldenweiser.

Edward A. Filene ("First N. R. A. Promoter"): H. J. Laski, Jesse I. Straus, Louis Kirstein, Albert Einstein, L. A. Steinhardt, and William C. Bullitt.

Then under ("Father of the New Deal"), there are Louis Dembitz Brandeis, Samuel I. Rosenman, Herbert C. Lehman, Samuel Untermyer, Samuel Dickstein, F. LaGuardia, and Rabbi Wise.

So this publication has wide distribution throughout the country?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. A number of these have come to the attention of the committee, and it is typical of what Mr. Edmondson is putting out?

Mr. METCALFE. It is typical.

Now we have an organization, which I think is an important finding—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Pardon me. Going back to Winrod, I want to get some definite statement of Gerald B. Winrod, in view of the fact that he has issued denials and protested vigorously. But as we do not want to do any injustice, of course you have other evidence besides the question of his own statements?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you also have some additional pamphlets of his; have you not?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. We have had them before the committee.

Now, one important group is the Industrial Defense Association of Boston, Mass., and the executive secretary is Edward H. Hunter.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any of Hunter's literature?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; we have his own letter, along with literature.

This organization was under investigation by a State legislative inquiry about a year ago in the State of Massachusetts. At that time it was charged with being of a Nazi character. I also, in investigating this organization, contacted the Boston Chamber of Commerce, and there was informed that Mr. Hunter had at some time been attempting to raise funds from business men, particularly in the Boston area, and around the country, and also from wealthy women in the Boston area.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee received a letter from Mr. Hunter, did we not?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. It was Mr. Hunter who accused me of being a Communist, and a lot of other things of that kind, and aroused our suspicions, and he was investigated. We have been able to obtain a letter dated September 29, 1938—I think it might be read into the record—in which he himself urges peoples to send to the German Propaganda Bureau for literature—to write direct to Germany, to one of the Nazi agencies, for literature.

The CHAIRMAN. The letterhead reads:

THE INDUSTRIAL DEFENSE ASSOCIATION, INC.

136 FEDERAL STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

Organized to inculcate the principals of Americanism in industrial, religious, fraternal, and educational circles.

Treasurer, Ross H. Currier, active in military, naval, and insurance circles.

Executive secretary, Edward H. Hunter, lecturer and organizer.

President, Edward G. Jay, consulting engineer.

Vice president, Miss Evvie F. Dalby, genealogist.

What is the necessity for a genealogist? They have got to go back to the blue blood in order to get into it, I suppose.

Mr. METCALFE. It is an anti-Semitic organization.

Mr. MASON. The purity of Nordic blood?

Mr. METCALFE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. This letter is dated September 29, 1938. [Reading:]

Mr. J. N. WILKERSON,
2404 E. Thirtieth Street,
Kansas City, Mo.

DEAR MR. WILKERSON: The communistic record of the chief witness against the Bund in New York, where several were convicted, is now so well known that it is quite evident the court of appeals will reverse the decisions of the lower court.

As a matter of fact, is it not true that you were the first one to expose the falsity of that oath?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You did that voluntarily?

Mr. METCALFE. Voluntarily; yes.

The CHAIRMAN (reading):

I am acquainted with Bund members in several parts of the country and do not want to know any finer or cleaner Americans than they are. I can assure you 99.9 percent of the propaganda against the Bund originates in communistic circles.

Regarding evidence against the Jews, please may I say that distribution of this material, if not true, would bring jail sentences to writers and distributors; therefore any publications that reach you will be authentic.

Have you been able to find any law that would punish anyone for disseminating racial or religious propaganda?

Mr. METCALFE. No. As I pointed out, the postmasters throughout the United States are of the opinion that there is need for some form of legislation that would prohibit the use of the mail to this type of indecent literature.

The CHAIRMAN. Then his statement is absolutely inaccurate there?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Because there is no law under which they can be punished.

Reading further from the letter:

In addition, you must realize the controlled press in the country is printing untrue statements regarding Hitler, for the purpose of inflaming the public mind to the point where the armed forces of this country may be used to destroy the German Government.

Under separate cover I am sending you copies of several publications. I would advise you to send a couple of dollars to World-Service, 4 Daberstedterstrasse, Erfurt, Germany, and George E. Deatherage, P. O. Box 467, St. Albans, W. Va., asking them to place your name on their mailing list. When you are in the money you may send us a contribution and we will see that you get some interesting material.

Very sincerely yours,

EDWARD H. HUNTER,
Executive Secretary.

Here are some more letters, but that is all that is necessary.

Mr. METCALFE. I have the Ku Klux Klan. There is no need of going into that.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no necessity of going into that. That has been gone into in days gone by.

Mr. METCALFE. The League for Christian Economics.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that league?

Mr. METCALFE. It is of East Radford, Va. However, in checking that organization I found that the man that was at the head of that organization, C. K. Howe, had moved to Beaufort, N. C.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any literature?

Mr. METCALFE. His literature recommends the Edmonston report that you have just read and the James True reports, and the Canadian Nationalist Party—that is the Fascist Party; George W. Christians' material, the Gerald B. Winrod publications, and all that sort of thing. He also recommends Colonel Sanctuary's book.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us see what he says. I quote from his publication called "Who Owns the U. S. A.?" [Reading:]

Do not be deceived by quack remedies like the Townsend plan. The only reason it looks good is because any plan that one might happen to think of is an improvement on the present system. It is said to be financed by the Jew Lowenthal.

Under the head of "Remedy," he says:

Last but not least, Congress should immediately provide an airtight national defense in order to block any attempt of these International conspirators to have the other nations "gang up on us." Read the protocols.

Under the head of "Last Minute News Items," he says:

The daily press, October 19, 1935, carries an article by Mark Sullivan, the Jew-owned "news" commentator, in which he quotes Secretary of State Hull as favoring "stabilizing" the international currency. At the time Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, is in Europe, probably getting secret instructions from the Rothschilds that cannot be trusted to the cables.

There is no use in reading any more. That gives an idea of the character of this propaganda.

Mr. METCALFE. Another organization is the Militant Christian Patriots, which originated in Glendale, Calif. The group is headed by Mrs. Leslie Fry and Mrs. Frances Maxey. [Handing papers to the chairman.]

The CHAIRMAN. This is a publication of four pages.

Mr. METCALFE. This literature is found in the headquarters of the German-American Bund in Los Angeles and is distributed by them.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; let us see what it says.

Lest We Forget—Dr. Wirt of Gary said the Roosevelt administration of "brain trusters" was to be the Kerensky type of stepping stone to the Bolshevik revolution in America.

To play the infamous part of either a Kerensky or a Karolyi in the history of a nation, means being the arch-traitor—the Judas guilty of handing the reins of constitutional government to the blood-thirsty leaders of international Judeo-Bolshevism, the Trotskys, Bela Kuns, Litvinoffs.

I think that indicates pretty well the type of propaganda they are disseminating.

There is also an organization known as the National American-Russian League, which is headed by Nicolai Melnikoff. Melnikoff is very prominent in German-American Bund circles, and has been a frequent speaker for the German-American Bund, and talks along the same lines as Fritz Kuhn.

While we have not any literature of that organization, we have many reports of Melnikoff's activities.

We also have an organization known as the National Christian Labor Party of America, of Chicago, Ill., and the leader of this

group is Victor Dekayville. His literature, I believe, will speak for itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a pamphlet headed, "Join the National Christian Labor Party of America." Then it says:

In view of existing emergencies, due to the continuation of the persistent assaults against American national life, traditions, Christian religion, morals, property rights, freedom of labor, and individual liberty by the forces of international political Judaism camouflaged as communism, socialism, atheism, and destructive liberalism and known generally the world over as the forces of the so-called Popular Front—a new political party has been created and is known forthwith as the National Christian Labor Party of America with its headquarters in Chicago, Ill.

Christian-Gentile Americans, men and women, are hereby invited to join the National Christian Labor Party.

I do not think there is any use in reading any more of that.

Mr. METCALFE. Yesterday, or on Saturday, you remember, we referred to the activities of Donald Shea, who has been brought into the hearings with reference to the Nazi and Facist testimony. You referred to a photograph.

In presenting the National Youth League, which is headed by Mr. Shea, an organization with headquarters in Washington, Baltimore, and Tacoma, Wash., we also associated him with Mrs. Lois DeLafayette Washburn.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever heard of any other members of his outfit, except himself?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; they hold meetings in Chicago and they hold meetings on the coast.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you spell Shea?

Mr. METCALFE. S-h-e-a.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is his photograph in this picture [indicating photograph].

Mr. METCALFE. In the center, with the white suit.

The CHAIRMAN. What does he have on his head?

Mr. METCALFE. I think that is one of the Black Shirt caps.

The CHAIRMAN. What do the flags show? I am asking this for the record. What flags do they have?

Mr. METCALFE. Right on that flag [indicating], it states, "Fascists."

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is enough of that.

Mr. METCALFE. Now we have the National Liberty Party, Tacoma, Wash., which was referred to a moment ago, headed by Frank Clark. Mr. Clark and Mrs. Washburn are moving in two of the organizations. One is the representative in the East for one group and the other is the representative in the Far West, and so on. They exchange literature.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything in their literature which is anti-racial or antireligious?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir. Clark is well-known for his anti-Semitism and for his close relationship with the German-American Bund on the Pacific coast.

The CHAIRMAN. In one of these communications it says:

With regards Fritz Kulm, I believe he will be authorized to come to the Northwest before very long and to meet yours truly. No matter what Fritz says from the platform every spy in the Nation will be nearby to get every word that he says, as all German Bunds are now on the spot, so they have got to come over where Americans will lead their battle for them. So when Fritz hears yours truly from the platform he will know that a package of dynamite has unloaded and in the good old American way.

That is signed, "G. P." What does that mean?

Mr. METCALFE. They go under different names.

The CHAIRMAN. Also, at the bottom of one of the pages of this printed matter, it says:

For further particulars write or telegraph, National Liberty Party, P. O. Box 471, Bremerton, Wash.

Mr. METCALFE. This is an organization that George W. Christian, of the American Fascist organization, is connected with.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not see any antireligious or antiracial matter in this pamphlet.

Mr. METCALFE. Of course, this pamphlet——

The CHAIRMAN. Is put out by them?

Mr. METCALFE. Of course, Clark is the western representative of Mrs. Washburn's organization.

The CHAIRMAN. You know that to be a fact?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; we have introduced letters disclosing that right in the correspondence.

The CHAIRMAN. The eleventh plank in the National Liberty Party platform says:

Expel false teachers from our schools; revise the textbooks. Rehabilitate America's lost culture and prosperity in order that we may "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," and that there may be "preservation of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" as is provided in the Constitution, "to secure which ends governments are instituted." No life is safe until Christians are safe from slaughter in their own native lands.

I do not see anything here that you could classify as antiracial or antireligious.

Here are also some photostat copies of letters. How do we know that these are genuine copies of the letters written by this organization?

Mr. METCALFE. We have the correspondence.

Yesterday I introduced an entire envelope full of this material with Clark's name on it, and his signature, and reference to the same organizations, his activities in the anti-Semitic work. I do not think there is any question about that.

Another organization is the National Protective Order of Gentiles, which was organized by Jack Peyton.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any evidence that they have any members outside of the organizer?

Mr. METCALFE. I picked this up at the headquarters of the German-American Bund in Los Angeles, and Peyton and Herman Schwinn, who is the western leader of the German-American Bund, work together on the coast. This particular piece is not so violent as some of the others.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a letter signed by Jack Peyton, dated March 11, 1937, and among other things he says:

We protest against the willful distortion of facts by the press and certain individuals, in the LaGuardia matter, especially when a minority group, represented by Mrs. Stephen Wise, of New York, demands of our Government (elected by the majority of the American people) a protest against statements of the German press allegedly to have been anti-American.

The remarks of the German press in this, or in any other instance, certainly have not been anti-American, but rather words directed against a group which is, so to speak, "at war" with Germany, and therefore these remarks can only be called anti-Jewish.

Also it says:

We feel that there are tremendous problems to be solved in our own country, which leave us little or no time to mingle into the affairs of other nations, nor to fight for a grudge a racial minority has against a nation in which their power and activities have been somewhat restricted.

That is signed "Yours very truly, National Protective Order of Gentiles, by Jack Peyton, secretary."

Mr. METCALFE. Then we have the order of Black Shirts. That was referred to on Saturday, and we know what their activities are.

Then there is the Pan-Aryan Alliance, of New York City, the secretary of which is Ernest F. Elmhurst. You will note the use of the swastika on that pamphlet [indicating].

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a publication put out and published by the Pan-Aryan Alliance, with the heading on the title page, "A Protocol of 1935 based on a careful study of the present-day Jewish activities."

They purport to present a copy of the protocol of 1935 in this pamphlet; is that right?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know what that protocol says, but I will read some excerpts into the record from this pamphlet to show what kind of an organization it is.

It says:

A Forgery?

After the hysterical efforts the Jews have undertaken for years to deny the authenticity of the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion" claiming same to a forgery; after the fruitless efforts of disproving their correctness in regard to their most significant contents; after the numerous attempts in the Jews' habitual manner by which they pretend to be both innocent and disinterested of actually desiring the principle of working toward a goal that, abridged, may be called "World Domination," all of which is topped by the last protocols of 1919 beside those which Prof. Sergius A. Nilus recovered and published in 1901, not to mention the previously adapted documents known as the Protocol of 1860 and that of 1869, the flood of denials from the accused Jews will not stop all the world over, wherever the Jews may fancy themselves as being powerful enough and capable of blinding the Gentile's eye and of dulling his mind in regard to the true course of Jewish history.

I think that is enough of that.

Mr. METCALFE. I also have here literature of the Patriot Guard of America, of New York City, of which the leader is Capt. Edward Page Gaston.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any of their literature?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; a lot of it. Gaston is a man who advocates, in his own statement, force and bloodshed to stamp out communism in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any evidence that any of these organizations have done anything to back communism?

Mr. METCALFE. No; there has been no evidence of anything along those lines, that they have actually done anything toward backing communism.

It might be noted that none of them have ever advocated democratic principles of government. Their attacks have been against communism; they have been pro-Fascist and pro-Nazi, but never once have they been for democracy.

Mr. MASON. Would you say an estimate of their activities would be that they use communism as an excuse for their pro-Fascist activities?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; as a smokescreen.

Mr. MASON. Because they know that the great majority of people are opposed to communism, and therefore——

Mr. METCALFE. They capitalize on that feeling.

Mr. MASON. It is good window dressing.

The CHAIRMAN. In that respect they are following the lines of the Communists, because they use anti-nazi-ism and anti-fascism as a smokescreen to hide their own activities, and they are always getting together and talking against nazi-ism and fascism but never against communism. That is the evident strategy they use to conceal their true efforts and designs.

I will read a quotation from this literature, showing what he said on September 17, 1937:

Capt. Edward P. Gaston is quoted by the Daily News as saying:

Force and bloodshed are needed to stamp out 100,000 seditious Communists in New York City. A whiff of grapeshot will go farther than moral suasion. In 6 months the Patriot Guard will patrol New York with 5,000 troops fully armed with pistols, rifles, tear-guns, and gas bombs.

He ought to be in some kind of psychopathic ward.

Mr. METCALFE. You have had the testimony relative to the activities of the Women's League of America, which was presented by witnesses from Milwaukee.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; we know about that.

Mr. METCALFE. There is an organization known as the Protestant War Veterans of the United States, with headquarters in New York, and the head of that organization is Edward James Smythe. We have one of his own letters.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is the letter, dated August 24, 1938, and at the top of the letterhead it says: "We're on the march again. This time for 25,000,000 membership by 1940."

In this letter he says:

DEAR MR. BLACKMAN: Your letter dated August 12 has been received and turned over to me for consideration and reply.

It is hard for us to answer all the letters with the same set of questions as our mail for the past year runs into the thousands every week——

That sounds familiar to people in Washington, in official circles——

This costs time and money so I will thank you now for enclosing the stamp.

The letter goes on to say:

Now, the Jews are our greatest menace at this time and they should and will be driven out of our political and economic life, otherwise we are doomed, just like Russia.

That is enough of that.

Mr. METCALFE. Then there is the Russian National Revolutionary Party of Putnam, Conn., and also the Russian Revolutionary Society, of the same place, and the leader of them is Vonsiatsky. He is a resident of Thompson, Conn. He was referred to in previous testimony. He has an arsenal and a little army of his own, of about 50 people, and they march around. They have been investigated by many groups. He is affiliated with the German-American Bund.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his first name?

Mr. METCALFE. His name is Anastose Andre Vonsiatsky.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not have anything on this Royal Order of——

Mr. METCALFE. No; I am skipping those. There is the Silver Legion, which is a Silver Shirt organization of Asheville, N. C., and the leader of that organization is William Dudley Pelley. Of course, a great deal of literature from Mr. Pelley's printing presses has been introduced here, and I think we are familiar with what he has been doing. We have a great deal more that we can file with the committee. His official title is Commander of the Silver Shirts.

The CHAIRMAN. You have presented a letter from A. H. E. Talpey, of Asheville, N. C., and the title on the letterhead is Pelley Publishers.

The letter says, under date of February 22, 1938:

DEAR MRS. WASHBURN: We have your letter of February 13.

Please do not feel concerned over the bill of \$12.50 for the consignment of No More Hunger. Under the circumstances you relate we shall be glad to have you remit at your convenience. Furthermore, if you have on hand some books which you cannot sell, we shall be glad to credit your account with any that you return.

You have our sympathy, and perhaps we can appreciate better than the average just what you have been confronting in the past. You are to be greatly commended for your courage and perseverance in the face of such discouraging circumstances.

Thank you for the reference to Shea.

Mr. METCALFE. That is Donald Shea.

The CHAIRMAN. The letter continues:

We have received very unflattering reports from other sources and are glad to have this information to add to that which we already possess.

With every good wish and trusting that the future holds for you much of happiness and achievement, we are,

Sincerely,

THE PELLEY PUBLISHERS,
ALFRED H. E. TALPEY.

Mr. METCALFE. Then there is an organization known as the Tomohawks, of Walla Walla, Wash. It puts out a weekly news letter issued by W. H. Harold. He is a member of the National Christian Labor Party, and this is typical:

Wake up; do something about this before it is too late! Send us one dime a week for your subscription.

He is well known for his activities out there in those particular circles.

The CHAIRMAN. This says in the heading on the last page [reading]:

A word to our readers. Weekly news letters are issued weekly on behalf of The Tomahawks, by W. H. Harold, P. O. box 365, Walla Walla, Wash. Subscription rates are 10 cents each, 50 cents per month, \$2.50 per 6 months, \$5 per year, payable to W. H. Harold. Those who can afford it are paying us \$5 or more for six months' subscription, due to the fact that all money received is used for the extension of the service. We have been issuing these "letters" to a steadily expanding mailing list since August. We appreciate the help and encouragement we have received.

We try to bring you "news—behind-the-news" from the most authoritative sources, and thus present only material which we believe to be accurate.

Then it also says:

And now we have today Felix Frankfurter, a man born in the ghettos of Austria, the most powerful in the administration, who is a defender of those whose object is the destruction of the private property right.

Mr. METCALFE. Here is Uncle Sam's Crusade, published by Uncle Sam's Club, at Bismarck, N. Dak. The material is edited by George J. Singer, Jr., and I believe it will speak pretty well for itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a publication which states that it is published by Uncle Sam's Club, price 25 cents. On the front page it says:

Wars—Revolutions—Murders—Plagues—Destruction—Depression—Unemployment—Social Strikes—The world in general has been thrown into a real hell—by whom?

Then it says, on the inside:

Communism, a weapon for Jews to conquer the world. What the Jews themselves say about it, taken from The Key.

The Key is a magazine published in Canada, and has had a wide distribution throughout the United States.

Mr. METCALFE. By the Canadian Fascist group.

The CHAIRMAN. Then it quotes from The Key various statements which I am not going to read. It contains attacks upon different Jews throughout the United States, does it not?

Mr. METCALFE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. It says, on another page:

Who profits by communism? Those who invest their money in it: The Jews.

Then on another page it says:

"We, Jews, have landed you into a new Hell," Dr. Oscar Levy says.

Then, on the next page, it says:

A Rabbi pleads guilty and justifies anti-Jews.

That is the type of stuff they put out.

Mr. METCALFE. Then there is an organization known as the "V. B. A.," or Volksbund Fuer das Deutscher im Ausland. That is Germans brought out of their native country, and that organization was testified to as having Jewish activities at a previous hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. In what cities does it operate?

Mr. METCALFE. They are all over the country.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a general statement.

Mr. METCALFE. They originate in Germany; their headquarters are right in Germany; they originated from there, and they spread out all over the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. They work through the German-American Bund?

Mr. METCALFE. No; through the German Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any information as to how many there are?

Mr. METCALFE. No; we have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Why do you say they operate throughout the country?

Mr. METCALFE. We had testimony here showing that they attended a convention that was held recently in Germany where they took an oath, and the German Ambassador protested against the statement, stating that we had not correctly translated the version of the oath taken by these people in Germany, and he then set forth his own translation, and when we compared his translation with our translation we found them strangely enough, identical, word for word.

The CHAIRMAN. This organization is the one that is mentioned in the letters that passed between Gissibl and the Nazi Party in Germany?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no information as to the strength of it in the United States, or the size of it.

Mr. METCALFE. Then we have an organization known as the White Guard and also the White Front, which is sponsored by William Gregg Blanchard, post-office box 191, at Live Oak, Fla.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is one of their circulars.

AMERICANS

Fight with the white front for racial nationalism.

A patriotic conquest of power.

The white front's five-point program for American regeneration.

Subordinate class interests to national welfare.

That is the same principle as that of the Nazis?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Fascists?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (reading):

Fight under the lightning crash against the enemies of the white race and the Stars and Stripes!

Fight for the white supremacy in America and American supremacy in the New World!

Among other things, they advocate the segregation of the Jews.

Mr. METCALFE. We mentioned the other day Col. E. N. Sanctuary and another one of his organizations which was not listed the other day as the World Alliance Against Jewish Aggressiveness, New York City.

Then in addition to that there is another organization which was not mentioned yesterday, known as the American Fascists. It is also known as the Khaki Shirts of Philadelphia. We have a photograph here of this organization. Their name is sufficient to classify them.

The CHAIRMAN. How many organizations have you mentioned since we began Saturday morning, approximately?

Mr. METCALFE. One hundred.

The CHAIRMAN. A hundred organizations?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, sir; a little more than that, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. And they are organizations operating in the United States, preparing and disseminating propaganda of race and religious intolerance; is that not a fact?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes. When I say 100, I have omitted some of the organizations which we have not brought here, even though we have information about them, because it has not been checked. We have a total list of 135.

The CHAIRMAN. How many organizations would you say there are in the United States, based upon your investigation, that are disseminating racial and religious intolerance propaganda? Could you do that accurately?

Mr. METCALFE. My estimate is—

The CHAIRMAN. There are more than a hundred?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; I would say at least 200 organizations.

Mr. MASON. Would you say that a great proportion of them are in the game mainly for racketeering purposes?

Mr. METCALFE. Seventy-five percent.

Mr. MASON. And they are playing upon the credulity of the people in order to make money?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. They are also playing upon prejudices, are they not?

Mr. METCALFE. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did not these organizations try to get together in a national confederation at Asheville, N. C.?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; on two occasions they have attempted to get together.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the date of the first occasion?

Mr. METCALFE. It was early in 1936.

The CHAIRMAN. Who called that meeting?

Mr. METCALFE. That was called by the Rev. Ralph Nollner of Houston, Tex. It was held at Asheville, N. C., where there is also established the headquarters of the Silver Shirts, their national headquarters.

The CHAIRMAN. I think this is important enough so that we should reveal the source of your information. I do not see any reason why we should not do that. Your information with reference to these two meetings is based upon the report of the Department of Justice, is it not?

Mr. METCALFE. It is based upon our own information and substantiated by the Department of Justice report of its Nazi investigations.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, these two meetings?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Who were present at the first meeting, do you have the record there?

Mr. METCALFE. This was called the Christian conference, and here is what happened. It happened that the Rev. Nollner had invited two prominent rabbis to the conference. The result of this action by Nollner created a schism and a large group seceded. They refused to meet if there were to be any Jewish people present.

According to our information, among those who seceded were Howland Spencer of Hyde Park, N. Y. That is the same man who recently deeded his estate on the Hudson River to Father Devine.

James True of Washington, who issued the industrial reports that were referred to on Saturday.

The Rev. Louis R. Patmont of Berkeley, Calif., who is listed as a member of the faculty of the Mail Order Bible College, conducted by the family of the Rev. Gerald Winrod at Wichita, Kans.

Clyde J. Wright, of Houston, Tex., who runs a small publishing business and sells a good deal of British Fascist material, like *The Key*, to which you referred a few moments ago.

Also among those who seceded and held a rump convention of their own were Col. E. N. Sanctuary of New York; Harry A. Jung of Chicago, of the Vigilantes Federation of Chicago; Robert Edward Edmondson who was referred to here, from New York; George Deatherage of St. Albans, W. Va., the head of the Knights of the White Camelia; and Nelson E. Hewitt of Three Rivers, Mich.

In addition there were Mrs. J. A. Wakefield of Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. James Cunningham Gray of Boston, Mass.; the Rev. Oliver E. Williams of Pittsburgh; Rev. Rex A. Mitchell, of Paso Robles, Calif.; Edward Herman Rettig, of Seattle, Wash.; the Rev. Fred Bosworth, River Forest, Ill.; Fred E. Bennett, Kansas City, Mo.; Dr. W. B. Riley, Minneapolis, Minn.; Rev. E. P. Weber, Oklahoma City; and John S. Wise, Jr., New York City attorney, who has defended Edmondson on a number of occasions previous to that.

The CHAIRMAN. All of these people that you have named seceded from this first convention, you say?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes. They held a rump convention of their own. They refused to meet at the original call of the Christian conference because two rabbis had been invited.

The CHAIRMAN. And these are facts that were established by you upon investigation?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And they are substantiated by the Department of Justice report?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes. Reports came to this committee from several sources.

The CHAIRMAN. What I mean is, it is all substantiated by the results of the investigation of the Department of Justice?

Mr. METCALFE. In its Nazi investigation, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I wanted the record to show the source of the information.

Mr. METCALFE. In July of 1937 Deatherage, who was referred to a moment ago, attempted to hold another meeting, one more effort to get these people together, and we have here a copy of his letter of call for that particular meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this also substantiated by the Department of Justice report?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I have the letter here. It reads as follows:

A COALITION OF CHRISTIAN ANTI-COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

AMERICAN NATIONALIST CONFEDERATION

Boston—New York—Washington—Chicago—Houston—Miami—Savannah—
Los Angeles—San Francisco

P. O. Box 271, PALO ALTO, CALIF., July 30, 1937.

Mr. B. A. LLOYD,

3429 Baltimore Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.

DEAR SIR: The American Nationalist Confederation, composed of several Christian organizations and groups is calling a conference in Kansas City, Mo., on August 20, for the purpose of discussing the causes of unrest underlying our present day national life and seeking immediate remedies.

You or any organization whom you represent are cordially invited to send delegates and representatives. The main purpose of the gathering is to group all patriotic bodies whose leaders and followers are determined to put aside pussy-footing methods of dealing with the meaning of communism, at whose core stands internationalism. It is internationalism which is responsible for our present political, financial, economic, and religious chaos. Our challenge is therefore a direct one to internationalism under all its aspects, whether centered in the League of Nations, Zionism, International Labor Office, or in Washington.

The sovereign rights of the United States have been infringed to the danger point, and means must be sought and found to restore them in full. Complete independence of each of our patriotic bodies is the price of our national freedom

which must be speedily reconquered, if our American Constitution, civil and religious liberties, and institutions are to be saved.

If the board and committee of your organization are free and independent from any financial pressure which international individuals or groups may bring to bear upon them, it is our hope that you will be represented at the conference in Kansas, and that our united efforts will bear fruit for the salvation of our Christian faith, our Constitution, means of national defense, our system of economic voluntarism, freedom of the workers, and the welfare of the people of our great Nation.

With your acceptance to this call, we shall immediately issue credentials in the number you request, as well as further necessary data.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE E. DEATHERAGE, *President*.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask in that connection, what do they mean when they use the word "internationalists"?

Mr. METCALFE. Jews.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a common term used by a number of these organizations, but what they actually mean is Jews?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; that is right. Present at this conference, which was held at the Hotel Philips in Kansas City, Mo.—on August 20, 1937—were representatives of the following groups, many of which have been listed here: The Militant Christian Patriots; American Nationalist Confederation; American Vigilante Intelligence Federation; Defenders of the Christian Faith; American People's Party; Silver Shirts of America; Crusaders for Economic Liberty; Edmondson Economic Service; Washington's Bodyguards; and the German-American Bund.

Now, in greeting this gathering, Deatheridge stated as follows, and I quote, and this is substantiated by the Department of Justice report:

We have I may say frankly 1 million or more members in their different groups—

That, of course, is a terrific overstatement of fact.

The CHAIRMAN. All of these organizations claim large memberships?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes; they talk in the millions.

Now is the time that all those units should act as one. All the forces of our militant American Christian organizations must cooperate on a national scale under the guiding spirit of each unit's own leaders as a board of strategy. It will be a gigantic struggle, but Christian civilization will win.

Now attending that same gathering was the Rev. Gerald B. Winrod of Kansas City, the man you referred to. The Department of Justice quotes Mr. Winrod as having made the following statement at the conference—

The CHAIRMAN. Before you do that, I think the Department of Justice requested that we do not give any quotations from their report; that we do not make them public. I think my question to you was proper as to whether or not what you were testifying to was substantiated by the Department of Justice's own independent investigation and by their report. I think that is as far as we can properly go in view of their request. We want to cooperate with them. So do not let us have any direct quotations or anything purporting to be the language of the report of the Department of Justice.

Mr. METCALFE. Do you want the general trend of this [indicating paper].

The CHAIRMAN. We will hold this in abeyance. We will respect the wishes of the Department of Justice in this matter.

Mr. METCALFE. Here is one of Deatheridge's instructions to leaders which he is sending out around the country.

The CHAIRMAN. At present?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. He suggests in this that the fiery swastika should be the emblem of the new Confederation, and so on and so forth?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes. Do you want that in the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Is this substantiated by the Department of Justice file?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be made a part of the record.

(The document referred to is as follows:)

CONFIDENTIAL TO LEADERS

It is a well-known fact, of course, that any movement needs something to dramatize it, to appeal to the public's sense of sensationalism. Something to talk about, and to wonder about.

The Ku Klux Klan brought this to a great effectiveness in the burning of the cross. The fiery cross of the Klan brought terror to those that had cause to fear, and its mere appearance in a locality was enough to cause evildoers to cease their activities.

Using this same proven method in a similar manner, the burning of the Swastika—at numerous locations in all the States of the Union—will have the same effect on the reds and their sympathizers, including the Jews, as it had on the Negro and the carpetbagger.

The fiery swastika, burned between the hours of 9 in the evening and 11 at night, will give our movement that which it must have—publicity. Whether it be good or bad—any publicity is good publicity at this time. We must break this conspiracy of silence.

In practice, the swastika is made from 2- by 4-inch, or similar lumber, about 20 feet overall, wrapped with jute or oakum and soaked waste crankcase oil. It is supported on a post which is not wrapped. If the stunt is to be done more than once, then swastika should be made out of iron pipe, and similarly wrapped and soaked in oil. Prepared in this manner, it will burn about 20 minutes.

A high spot, overlooking the town or city, should be chosen, where it can be easily seen. Only a few men are needed to handle it as the swastika should be set in sections, bolted together in such a way that it can be easily transported in a touring car.

The press should be tipped off, if possible, in advance or immediately after the swastika is set afire. The idea is to have as many pictures of it as possible broadcast throughout the Nation.

You are urged to cooperate in covering the Nation with the fiery swastika, and we believe that you will agree that it will cause an immediate flood of publicity, for the enemy is extremely jittery. Let us push it along and we are sure that if you will take the lead in your territory, we will force this matter out in the open.

The actual work must be done secretly and the identity of those assisting should never be revealed. Not that it especially matters, but the more mystery there is about it, the more effective it will be.

If you cooperate, please advise the results and send us copies of press reports in triplicate. We will reciprocate by advising you how it is doing in other sections.

Please acknowledge receipt of this communication and advise what territory, city, or town you will cover.

Pro Patria.

AMERICAN NATIONALIST CONFEDERATION,
St. Albans, W. Va.

The CHAIRMAN. Just one or two questions, Mr. Metcalfe. This effort to get together did not succeed?

Mr. METCALFE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did it not succeed?

Mr. METCALFE. It seems that all the efforts that have been made to get these people together failed because, first, they cannot decide upon who is going to be the super fuehrer of these groups; and secondly, they realized that, once they merged, the individual sources of revenue that these groups have had would be shut off. For that reason, they have never been able to get together.

The CHAIRMAN. Each fellow wanted to pitch, and they could have only one pitcher on the team; is that it?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes. Principally their source of revenue, their individual source of revenue, might be cut off. And everybody wanted to be the leader.

The CHAIRMAN. How is it that these two rabbis were invited by the Rev. Nollner?

Mr. METCALFE. Different organizations around the country that had been reached through these invitations, some of them were not of the same caliber, and they brought pressure to bear on Rev. Nollner to take a more liberal attitude in his invitations. They believed that if there was to be a conference of this kind, of a national character, all religions and all races ought to be represented. The result of this pressure on Rev. Nollner was that he issued an invitation to two rabbis, and that, of course, resulted in a complete break-up of the conference.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you have stated the essential facts with reference to these conventions. The committee will recess at this time until 1:30.

(Whereupon a recess was taken until 1:30 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

The committee reconvened at 1:30 o'clock, p. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT E. HALPERN, NEW YORK CITY

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mosier will question you, and the Chair asks you to make your answers responsive to the question. Answer yes or no, with such explanations as are pertinent thereto.

Mr. HALPERN. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. You are under subpoena?

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are under subpoena to appear here.

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you please state your full name?

Mr. HALPERN. Robert E. Halpern.

Mr. MOSIER. Where do you live?

Mr. HALPERN. In New York City.

Mr. MOSIER. What is your address in New York City?

Mr. HALPERN. 23 East One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Street.

Mr. MOSIER. What is your business?

Mr. HALPERN. I am at present employed by the Hanover Sales Corporation.

Mr. MOSIER. Where is that located?

Mr. HALPERN. 165 Broadway.

Mr. MOSIER. How long have you been employed by the Hanover Sales Corporation?

Mr. HALPERN. Since November 1937.

Mr. MOSIER. Prior to November 1, 1937, in what business were you engaged?

Mr. HALPERN. I was president of the Soviet-American Securities Corporation.

Mr. MOSIER. Where was that company's office located?

Mr. HALPERN. 20 Broad Street, New York.

Mr. MOSIER. How long have you been president of that company?

Mr. HALPERN. One year.

Mr. MOSIER. What was the business of that company while you were the president?

Mr. HALPERN. The sale of Soviet securities in this country.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you describe for the record and for the information of the committee a bond issue of the Soviet Union that you participated in selling in this country?

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir. The title of the issue was second 5-year plan loan. It bore interest at the rate of 7 percent annually, issued in 1933, maturing in 1943, with interest payable quarterly.

Mr. MOSIER. What was the par amount of that loan?

Mr. HALPERN. 10,000,000 gold rubles.

Mr. MOSIER. When was that loan offered in this country?

Mr. HALPERN. The issue was dated October 1933 and first offered in July 1933 in advance of the issuance date.

Mr. MOSIER. Were you connected with the Soviet Securities Co. when that issue was offered?

Mr. HALPERN. I joined the Soviet-American Securities Corporation in August 1933.

Mr. MOSIER. When you joined it, was this company engaged in the distribution of that issue, and its sale over the United States?

Mr. HALPERN. It was.

Mr. MOSIER. What was its success in the distribution of the issue?

Mr. HALPERN. They were completely distributed.

Mr. MOSIER. What is the value in American money of 10,000,000 rubles?

Mr. HALPERN. At the present time?

Mr. MOSIER. Yes.

Mr. HALPERN. Roughly $8\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars.

Mr. MOSIER. What was the difference occasioned by?

Mr. HALPERN. By the variation in the valuation of the gold dollar.

Mr. MOSIER. That caused the value to shrink to $8\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars.

Mr. HALPERN. It caused the value to increase. As the gold content of the dollar declined, it meant that the American dollars required to buy the same amount of gold was naturally more. At the time of the issue the value was approximately \$7,000,000, but at the present time its value is \$8,500,000.

Mr. MOSIER. Will you describe what sort of distribution was made of these securities, in terms of numerical holders of these securities, and by States, if you can?

Mr. HALPERN. Well, geographically there were purchases in almost every State of the Union.

Mr. MOSIER. How many individual holders are there? Do you know, roughly?

Mr. HALPERN. About from 4,000 to 4,500.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did a majority of them reside, or in what States?

Mr. HALPERN. A good portion of them were in New York State.

The CHAIRMAN. What proportion?

Mr. HALPERN. I am afraid I do not have that statistical data.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say a majority of them?

Mr. HALPERN. I would hesitate to put in a recorded statement without having the facts before me.

Mr. MOSIER. You say that 10,000,000 rubles, par amount, of the securities issued are now outstanding in the United States?

Mr. HALPERN. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. Are there any other securities of the Soviet Government issued and outstanding in the United States that you know of?

Mr. HALPERN. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. MOSIER. Was \$10,000,000 the total amount of the issue authorized, or was that a part of a larger issue?

Mr. HALPERN. It was 10,000,000 gold rubles. That was the authorized portion of a large internal issue authorized for sale in this country.

Mr. MOSIER. But only 10,000,000 rubles were sold in this country.

Mr. HALPERN. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. What is your business now, Mr. Halpern, with the Hanover Importing Co.?

Mr. HALPERN. It is the Hanover Sales Corporation.

Mr. MOSIER. What is your business with the Hanover Sales Corporation?

Mr. HALPERN. Purchasing here for the Spanish Royalist Government, and the sale of its products.

Mr. MOSIER. You purchase materials in this country for the account of the Spanish Royalist Government.

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And you import into this country goods, wares, and merchandise produced in Loyalist Spain.

Mr. HALPERN. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. How long have you been with this company?

Mr. HALPERN. I think you asked that question before. I joined it in either late October or early November 1937.

Mr. MOSIER. What is your official connection with this new company?

Mr. HALPERN. I am import manager.

Mr. MOSIER. You are import manager?

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You have to do only with what comes in from Loyalist Spain.

Mr. HALPERN. That is right.

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. Halpern, are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You do partake or participate in some of its activities, do you not?

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You never have?

Mr. HALPERN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever attend a unit meeting of the Communist Party?

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You never attended any of their meetings?

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any other name that you are known by, Mr. Halpern?

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever gone under the name of Hall?

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Or Hanover?

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You say you have never used the name of Bob Hall?

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you believe in the oath that you are taking?

Mr. HALPERN. Indeed I do, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Is there any other information you can give the committee concerning the issue and sale of any other securities of the Soviet Government in the United States?

Mr. HALPERN. I do not understand the question.

Mr. MOSIER. Is there any other information you can give concerning issues sold of these securities that you have described?

Mr. HALPERN. I will be glad to answer any questions directly.

Mr. MOSIER. Can you give any further information concerning those securities that might be of interest and value to this committee?

Mr. HALPERN. I cannot think of any. If you would like to ask any questions, I will be glad to answer them, or specific questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Who were some other people connected with the Soviet-American Securities Corporation, when you were with them?

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Miles Sherovar.

The CHAIRMAN. Does he live in New York?

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was his position?

Mr. HALPERN. He was president of the corporation prior to my becoming president.

The CHAIRMAN. What did he become when you took the presidency?

Mr. HALPERN. I cannot tell what he did immediately thereafter. Later he became president of the Hanover Sales Corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. Who else was connected with that corporation?

Mr. HALPERN. While I was president, the other principal shareholder was Mr. L. A. Freedman, Jr.

The CHAIRMAN. He also resides in New York City?

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Who else was connected with it?

Mr. HALPERN. They were the principal officers.

The CHAIRMAN. You have named the principal officers?

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he have any connection with the Soviet Government at all?

Mr. HALPERN. That I cannot answer. I can only say that during the period I had full control as president our dealing was entirely in this market with people who had already purchased bonds, and occasionally with the bank of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The CHAIRMAN. Your dealings were with people who were given the right to sell those bonds, or the original right?

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Was this company incorporated under the laws of New York?

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know who the stockholders were?

Mr. HALPERN. Originally?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HALPERN. I do not know. I know who the stockholders were when I became an officer.

The CHAIRMAN. Who were they?

Mr. HALPERN. L. A. Freedman, Jr., and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you both own the entire capital stock?

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. MOSIER. I would like to ask about the Soviet Securities Corporation, whose name was later changed to the Soviet-American Securities Corporation: Did that company have an underwriting agreement with the Soviet Union for the sale of these securities?

Mr. HALPERN. I am afraid I cannot answer that. That would be before I had knowledge of the policies and arrangements of the corporation.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know who would be able to answer that?

Mr. HALPERN. Any of the former officers, I suppose.

Mr. MOSIER. Would Mr. Sherover?

Mr. HALPERN. He might. I am sure he would be able to answer.

Mr. MOSIER. Was there any legal proceeding that your company had to go through with in the State of New York, or before the State Department, or any division of the Securities Exchange Commission, in order to qualify these securities for sale in the United States?

Mr. HALPERN. The securities are registered with the Securities Exchange Commission.

Mr. MOSIER. You mean that your corporation was registered.

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. But you do not know whether the issue itself was qualified through application to the Securities Exchange Commission, either in New York or in Washington.

Mr. HALPERN. I believe the securities were issued prior to the time when the Commission was established. That is my understanding, if my memory serves me correctly.

Mr. MOSIER. You would have to qualify the securities in the State of New York for sale in the State of New York.

Mr. HALPERN. The secretary of state of New York State, I believe, requires the filing of a form under oath under an act passed some years ago, which, we, of course complied with. I think it is the Martin Act.

Mr. MOSIER. That, of course, depends on the commission as to the bonds or securities your house sold. The question is whether, or not, they could be qualified by simply filing a certain form.

Mr. HALPERN. I had no part in that, and I am afraid I cannot shed much light on that.

Mr. MOSIER. You do not know what underwriting commission, if any, your house received for the sale of those securities?

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what profit your corporation received from the sale of the bonds?

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the total profit?

Mr. HALPERN. During the year?

The CHAIRMAN. During all of the time.

Mr. HALPERN. That I do not know. During the year in which I was president it was about \$15,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That was for the sale of how many bonds?

Mr. HALPERN. I do not remember. That was the turnover in trading in the market. That was not a commission.

Mr. MOSIER. If anybody wanted to sell a bond or buy a bond, they simply put it through your house, and you charged a commission.

Mr. HALPERN. We bought at one price and sold at another.

Mr. MOSIER. Then you gambled on the market a little yourself.

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir. That has no relationship to an underwriting commission.

The CHAIRMAN. What is this Hanover Co., that you are now connected with? What is your position in it?

Mr. HALPERN. Import manager.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it connected with the Loyalist Government of Spain?

Mr. HALPERN. I do not know what kind of agreement there is. I cannot answer that.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not been informed about it.

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir; I have considered that matter beyond my interest.

The CHAIRMAN. You have nothing to do with the shipment of any ambulances, or anything of that sort, to Spain?

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir; not to my knowledge. I am not familiar with the details of the department which handles exports.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know what the exports have been?

Mr. HALPERN. I have a general idea, but I cannot give the details.

The CHAIRMAN. What imports come over?

Mr. HALPERN. There are a number of items that come in small quantities, including paprika.

The CHAIRMAN. What would be the total value of the imports during the time you were there, approximately?

Mr. HALPERN. Roughly, \$100,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The exports would far exceed that amount.

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir; very much so.

The CHAIRMAN. Are the exports purchased with funds raised in the United States?

Mr. HALPERN. I am not in a position to answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know where the money comes from to buy the exports?

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir. Not having anything to do with that end of the business, I cannot answer that question. I hardly think so, however. It is much too large an amount, for one thing.

The CHAIRMAN. If you do not know, why do you think so?

Mr. HALPERN. I know there is a lot of business being done.

The CHAIRMAN. How can you express an opinion about it?

Mr. HALPERN. I know they are very busy. There is a lot of activity.

The CHAIRMAN. But you do not know where the money comes from?

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it all exported to Loyalist Spain?

Mr. HALPERN. On the whole, yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All of these exports are going to Loyalist Spain.

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. On what ships?

Mr. HALPERN. They have been going via London and Antwerp, with transshipments.

The CHAIRMAN. They use ships owned by the Loyalist Government?

Mr. HALPERN. They have been shipped on British ships, and then reshipped.

The CHAIRMAN. On what ships do your imports come? What ships do they use?

Mr. HALPERN. Again, I am afraid I cannot answer that. I will be glad to give you any information I know.

The CHAIRMAN. We are not asking you for anything you do not know. What is Mr. Sherover's first name?

Mr. HALPERN. Miles.

The CHAIRMAN. He is at 165 Broadway?

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know a man by the name of Ralph Hanover?

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. He is not connected with your company in any way?

Mr. HALPERN. Not to my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. Did your company during the time you were connected with the Soviet American Securities Corporation have any relation with the Amtorg Trading Co.?

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they have any conferences together?

Mr. HALPERN. I never did as president.

The CHAIRMAN. In any capacity did you ever confer with the Amtorg?

Mr. HALPERN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know who their officials are?

Mr. HALPERN. Not having conferred with them, I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. A person might know without conferring.

Mr. HALPERN. To my knowledge there was no such conference.

The CHAIRMAN. And you yourself personally do not know any of the officials of the Amtorg?

Mr. HALPERN. I do not; no.

The CHAIRMAN. Does your company keep books?

Mr. HALPERN. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Hanover Co. keeps books?

Mr. HALPERN. It is a corporation.

Mr. MASON. I would like to ask a question or two. Where were you born?

Mr. HALPERN. Boston, Mass.

Mr. MASON. What schools did you finish, Mr. Halpern?

Mr. HALPERN. New York University and George Washington High School.

Mr. MASON. Were you trained for any particular profession?

Mr. HALPERN. Financial work.

Mr. MASON. Business administration?

Mr. HALPERN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are quite positive in your statement that you not only have never been a Communist, but are not a Communist?

Mr. HALPERN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And do not believe in communism?

Mr. HALPERN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And that you have never attended any Communist meetings?

Mr. HALPERN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is all. Thank you.

Mr. Halpern, there is a witness here who is going to testify that you did attend Communist meetings. In fairness to you, don't you want to hear that testimony, so that you may have an opportunity to refute it if you so desire?

Mr. HALPERN. I will be very glad to.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee wants to be very fair about this proposition, and so we notify you to that effect.

Mr. HALPERN. Yes; thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. De Sola, will you take the stand?

TESTIMONY OF RALPH DE SOLA

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

Mr. MOSIER. Will you please state your name?

Mr. DE SOLA. Ralph De Sola.

Mr. MOSIER. Where do you live, Mr. De Sola?

Mr. DE SOLA. I live at 24 East Ninety-ninth Street, New York City.

Mr. MOSIER. How old are you?

Mr. DE SOLA. Twenty-nine.

Mr. MOSIER. And what is your business, Mr. De Sola?

Mr. DE SOLA. I am a zoologist, employed at present as a supervisor on the Federal writers' project of the W. P. A.

Mr. MOSIER. What is your education?

Mr. DE SOLA. After leaving DeWitt Clinton High School in New York City, I attended Swarthmore College and Columbia.

Mr. MOSIER. When did you finish at Columbia; what year?

Mr. DE SOLA. 1928.

Mr. MOSIER. And then what did you do after you finished Columbia?

Mr. DE SOLA. After I finished there I volunteered as a collector and interpreter for the New York Zoological Society which went on an expedition at that time to the Galapagos Islands.

Mr. MOSIER. How long were you there?

Mr. DE SOLA. I was there for a period of 4 months. When I returned I did some laboratory research for the New York Zoological Society.

Mr. MOSIER. What was your next job?

Mr. DE SOLA. My next job was an expedition to Cuba for the American Museum of Natural History, also for the New York Zoological Society. Subsequent to that I published articles on zoological subjects for the society, and technical papers. Later, about the beginning of 1932, following the publication of a book of mine for children, which Charles Scribners brought out, I opened, in partnership, a zoo at Miami, Fla. After this failed, due to the depression, I came back to New York, was unemployed and was taken from the relief rolls and put on the Federal writers' project.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you ever join the Communist Party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. When was that?

Mr. DE SOLA. About the end of 1933 or the beginning of 1934; I am not sure.

Mr. MOSIER. That was after your business venture at Miami, Fla., had failed?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What section of the Communist Party did you join?

Mr. DE SOLA. When I first joined, I was assigned, I believe, to section 20.

Mr. MOSIER. In what city?

Mr. DE SOLA. That was in Manhattan, on the upper west side of New York City.

Mr. MOSIER. And then did you transfer later to any other section, or did you remain in section 20?

Mr. DE SOLA. As my location of work on the W. P. A. was in another section of town to the section to which I had been assigned when I joined, I was transferred to another section which was nearer to the job location.

Mr. MOSIER. What position did you occupy in the Communist Party? Were you just an ordinary member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes. When I first joined, however, they found I had had some experience in children's work, having had experience in summer camps and having written articles for children; so they assigned me to children's work.

Mr. MOSIER. When was it that you had something to do with a magazine which is issued to children? Was it about that time?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir. Shortly after I joined, I did editorial work for a magazine that I see here. These [indicating] are obviously back issues of the Communist youth publication.

Mr. MOSIER. What is it?

Mr. DE SOLA. It is called the New Pioneer. It is issued every month.

Mr. MOSIER. That was a Communist publication, was it?

Mr. DE SOLA. Well, on the face of it it was not called a Communist publication, but it was put out by either people in the party or close to the party, and it had a party slant on the situation as it affected young people, especially children.

Mr. MOSIER. What was your official connection with that publication?

Mr. DE SOLA. At first I was asked to contribute several articles in my own field. I contributed a number of cartoons about the strange

habits of animals, and some natural-history materials. At one time I pinch-hit for the stamp editor when they had an issue of Soviet stamps. On other occasions I assisted the editor in doing general editorial work.

Mr. MOSIER. How long were you engaged on that publication, Mr. De Sola?

Mr. DE SOLA. I was never really employed by the publication. I did volunteer work there. It was considered one of the party assignments, and it probably went over a period of about 2½ years.

Mr. MOSIER. And at the time that you were connected with that publication, were you also in the Communist Party as a member?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you hold any official position with your fraction of the Communist Party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Well, I was not in any fraction of the Communist Party until I went on the Federal writers' project, and there a fraction was formed.

Mr. MOSIER. And did you have any official connection with that fraction?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes; I was secretary of that fraction.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, while you were connected with that fraction, or prior to that time, in your work in the Communist Party, did you have occasion to meet various other members of the Communist Party in New York?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you ever meet a man by the name of Bob Hall in New York?

Mr. DE SOLA. I did.

Mr. MOSIER. What was the occasion for your meeting him?

Mr. DE SOLA. While I was attached to the Federal writers' project, and was the fraction secretary, one of my duties was to make a weekly report to the leadership of section 24, to which the unit of the writers' project was attached. One of the functionaries there always took my report, and from time to time I met others there. That was in the natural course of contact.

Mr. MOSIER. And was it there when you were making your report that you met Bob Hall?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What was his connection, as you understood it, with the Communist Party?

Mr. DE SOLA. He was in charge of the financial operations of the section at that time, as I understood it.

Mr. MOSIER. And where was he located?

Mr. DE SOLA. They had their offices, I believe, on Fourth Avenue and Twenty-eighth Street; I think between Twenty-eighth and Twenty-ninth Streets.

Mr. MOSIER. You would make your report to that location; that office?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes.

Mr. MOSIER. And did you ever talk to Bob Hall at that office?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Have you seen the man here in this room today that you recognize as the Bob Hall whom you talked to in that office?

Mr. DE SOLA. I think I saw him on the stand just before he was sworn in.

Mr. MOSIER. Would you say the gentleman over there [indicating] is the one?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes; I would say that was Bob Hall.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you right there, to qualify you: Are you certain that that is the man?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes; that is the man.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, in any of these fraction groups, did you ever meet Willis Morgan?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Who is Willis Morgan, if I may ask?

Mr. DE SOLA. At the time he was the head of an organization called the City Projects Council. I believe he now has some function in the Workers Alliance.

Mr. MOSIER. Did you ever meet Oscar Fuss?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Who is he?

Mr. DE SOLA. I don't recall at the moment what his title was, but he was one of the officers of the City Projects Council.

Mr. MOSIER. Sam Wiseman?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes; I also met him.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know who he is?

Mr. DE SOLA. I do not know what his exact title is, but he is one of the officers of the Workers Alliance, I believe.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, when you went over to the writers' project, you may state, if you know, approximately how many employees there were on the writers' project.

Mr. DE SOLA. Well, when we first began there were not more than 75. I believe, though, that that number was stepped up pretty quickly as more and more people were taken from the relief rolls and the rolls of work relief, and I think our average personnel there has been about 300. However, the person to ask is Mr. Alsberg, the national director. I really do not have such figures, and they are not a part of my work.

Mr. MOSIER. At least there were two or three hundred on the project; you could say safely?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. And were you assigned to any particular work on the project?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes: when I first went there I was assigned as editor to edit the material for the New York City guide book on parks and other institutions in New York City.

Mr. MOSIER. And what were you assigned to subsequent to that?

Mr. DE SOLA. Later I developed a plan for a zoological project, the purpose of which was to elaborate and produce a series of popular natural histories on animal life.

Mr. MOSIER. And did you produce and publish any history on that subject?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes; we published the following: The first one we produced is called "Who's Who in the Zoo." That is a natural history of animals, written in popular style, and illustrated with candid-camera photos.

Mr. MOSIER. Was that produced under your supervision, Mr. De Sola?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir; I planned it and edited it and did the lay-out, and so forth.

Mr. MOSIER. What else did you do?

Mr. DE SOLA. Later we produced, in sequence, a book called "The Birds of the World." We now have just finished, and on the press at this moment, a third work in the series called "Reptiles and Amphibians," and we are now working on a fourth book, which will be at least equal in size to the three foregoing books, a work called "The Natural History of the United States."

Mr. MOSIER. During the time that you have produced the books that you mention, has the balance of the Federal writers' project produced any books?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes; they have. I was assisted by a staff of some 10 people, whom I chose because of their excellence and because of their interest in the work. The rest of the project, though, has produced books. The principal achievement is the first volume of the New York City guide book, which is called "Panorama of New York." They have also produced a book in English called "Italians of New York," and they are about to go to press with an Italian translation of the same work. They have also recently issued a book call "Landsmannschaft," which is an account of various organizations in New York City. They published two annual almanacs, and I believe they have a number of other books in press at this time, but I am not qualified to report on that.

Mr. MOSIER. Those books that you have just mentioned are produced by others than yourself?

Mr. DE SOLA. Well, others than myself and my own group.

Mr. MOSIER. But you and your group did produce these books that you have called the attention of the committee to?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, Mr. De Sola, there was a sit-down strike in the Federal writers' project last year, was there not?

Mr. DE SOLA. I believe there was, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Were you employed at the time of the sit-down strike in the Federal writers' project?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You may state, if you know, whether or not the Workers' Alliance is active in the Federal writers' project in New York?

Mr. DE SOLA. Well, yes. They are represented in the project by the Federal Writers' Local of the Workers' Alliance. That is the organization to which the union workers on the job attach themselves.

Mr. MOSIER. That is the union of the Federal writers' project in the Workers Alliance?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, in your work as a member of the Communist Party, and from your general knowledge, what would you say as to whether or not the Workers Alliance unit of the Federal writers' project is or is not dominated by the Communist members?

Mr. DE SOLA. I would say that it would be fair to say that the local was controlled by the Communist members. They are the most

active people there, and obviously, because of their activity, they are entrusted with jobs, and they get the support of people there.

MR. MOSIER. I want to ask you this question while it is fresh in my mind. You know, do you not, that this committee has had before it as witnesses writers and others connected with the Federal writers' project?

MR. DE SOLA. Yes; I have heard that. Various people in the office have mentioned that they have been subpoenaed here.

MR. MOSIER. Has that been the subject of discussion in your office?

MR. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

MR. MOSIER. I will ask you whether or not it has been the subject of criticism.

MR. DE SOLA. Yes, sir. Everyone who has come here, including myself, has been labeled as a stool pigeon, a rat, a Fascist, a Trotskyite, and so forth.

MR. MOSIER. And I will ask you whether or not literature has been printed and issued on that subject?

MR. DE SOLA. Yes. I believe the Communists issued a leaflet. I think I have one here. I know the project workers' newspaper mentioned it; yes, here is a leaflet issued by the Communist unit of the Federal writers' project, entitled "For Unity Against the Splitters!" They accuse everyone of coming here with the intention of wanting to split the Federal writers' project.

MR. MOSIER. Do you know whether or not anyone has been dealt out any punishment for coming here?

MR. DE SOLA. No; I do not believe anyone has; but I think it might be fair to interject the remark that leaflets of this character and remarks of the character that are passed in the office tend to intimidate people. I know that articles that appeared about myself, that I considered were quite unprovoked, in the Communist shop paper which I formerly edited when I was a member of the Party—the Red Pen—including a number of writers of some distinction, have provoked a great deal of ill feeling. I know that articles that have appeared in the Communist press, magazines as well as newspapers, have run along the same line of defaming the character of anyone that appeared here.

MR. MOSIER. Anyone that appeared before this committee was either a stool pigeon or a rat?

MR. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

MR. MOSIER. Now tell me, Mr. De Sola: At the present time is there any fight on—I will say controversy rather than fight—is there any controversy on in your department between the so-called Communists and Fascists?

MR. DE SOLA. In my own department there is not.

MR. MOSIER. I do not mean your 8 or 10 assistants; I mean in this Federal writers' project generally.

MR. DE SOLA. No; there is not at the present time, though there was at one time.

MR. MOSIER. There was quite a sharp split at one time, was there not, between the Communists and the so-called Fascists?

MR. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

MR. MOSIER. Has that quieted down now?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes; it has, as the result of some drastic actions on the part of the administration, plus a change of heart on the part of some of the people who were engaged in the controversy.

Mr. MOSIER. Now, going back to the sit-down strike, when was that sit-down strike, approximately?

Mr. DE SOLA. If my memory serves me correctly, it was somewhere in the late spring, I would say May or June, of last year.

Mr. MOSIER. 1937?

Mr. DE SOLA. I think that is correct.

Mr. MOSIER. And you said, I believe, that you were employed there at that time?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What were the grievances which caused the sit-down strike, if you know?

Mr. DE SOLA. There was the threat of lay-offs at the time, due to the fear that Congress would not appropriate enough in the way of funds to keep the project going at its full quota. There was also a standing grievance on sick leave with pay. There was some pressure for the passage of several bills which were pending before Congress, and also a plea for higher wages in order to meet the increased costs of living.

Mr. MOSIER. And they took the view, did they, that they would strike; that a strike would assist in impressing their views upon Congress?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. How long did that strike last?

Mr. DE SOLA. I don't know. I think it lasted the better part of a week, though.

Mr. MOSIER. And who were the dominating figures in the strike? Did you have a strike committee?

Mr. DE SOLA. There was a strike committee. I was a supervisor at the time, however, and I really do not know who the leading lights were.

Mr. MOSIER. What did they do; just keep everybody in on the project for a week?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes; they kept them there. They had food that was brought in from the outside; and they had cots and blankets there, and there they lived for the duration of the week.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know a Mr. Nicholas Wirth on your project?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What is his official connection with your project?

Mr. DE SOLA. He is chief editor of the project. I think his official title is managing editor, or perhaps it is assistant chief project supervisor. If you have the rolls of the project, though, you can get that.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know whether Mr. Wirth—Nicholas Wirth; W-i-r-t-h—has any other name that he goes under?

Mr. DE SOLA. I do not know.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know whether he is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes.

Mr. MOSIER. You say he is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Well, he was at the same time I was.

Mr. MOSIER. You do not know whether he is still a member?

Mr. DE SOLA. No; I do not.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know a man by the name of Lou Godey?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What is his position?

Mr. DE SOLA. Managing project supervisor.

Mr. MOSIER. Was he a member of the Communist Party when you were a member?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know Berne de Ward?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir. He has the same title that I have. He is project supervisor.

Mr. MOSIER. Was he a member of the Communist Party when you were a member of the party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know Louella Hinkel?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes.

Mr. MOSIER. Who is she?

Mr. DE SOLA. She has the same title—project supervisor.

Mr. MOSIER. Was she a member of the party while you were a member of the party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know Joe Barrett?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. What is his official connection with the W. P. A. project?

Mr. DE SOLA. He is also a project supervisor.

Mr. MOSIER. Was he a member of the Communist Party while you were a member?

Mr. DE SOLA. No; he was not.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know David Rosenberg?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Is he a supervisor also?

Mr. DE SOLA. I believe he is. I do not know just what his rank is, though.

Mr. MOSIER. Was he a member of the Communist Party while you were a member?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Roy Ottley—is he also a supervisor?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes; he is a supervisor.

Mr. MOSIER. Was he a member of the Communist Party while you were a member?

Mr. DE SOLA. No; he was not.

Mr. MOSIER. These members of the Communist Party that you have testified to—did you ever see them in Communist meetings?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. You attended Communist meetings, did you, pretty regularly while you were a member of the party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir; I did at least once a week.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know Sol Becker?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir; I know him.

Mr. MOSIER. Was he connected with the Federal writers' project?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes.

MR. MOSIER. Was he a member of the Communist Party while you were a member?

MR. DE SOLA. He was.

MR. MOSIER. And was he connected with the Daily Worker in some capacity?

MR. DE SOLA. I believe he was in charge of a fund-raising campaign.

MR. MOSIER. Did you ever sit in any party meetings with Bernard Conal?

MR. DE SOLA. Bernard Conal; yes, I did.

MR. MOSIER. Who is Mr. Conal?

MR. DE SOLA. He is a field worker on the Federal writers' project.

MR. MOSIER. Do you think he is a member of the Communist Party?

MR. DE SOLA. I do not know what he is in now. I have not spoken to him in some time.

MR. MOSIER. But, at least while you were a member of the party and attended meetings, he also attended the same meetings?

MR. DE SOLA. Yes.

MR. MOSIER. I wonder if you would tell the committee, Mr. De Sola, the occasion for your leaving the Communist Party?

MR. DE SOLA. Yes, sir. It was in 1936, during the campaign between Landon and Roosevelt. The party tried to impress me with the fact that I should help in the campaign for Roosevelt by the indirect tactic of pointing out that Landon was the greater evil. They tried to convince me that if Landon was elected we would have Fascism in a very short time in this country; and some of the hysterical members went so far as to assure me that every parking lot would be turned into a concentration camp. Having lived here for some years, having been born here, and having been American in all my background, this seemed so fantastic that I did not believe it. It also seemed equally fantastic to me, as a Communist, that Roosevelt was the leader of the people's front, and that he represented any lesser evils of the situation. I also regarded him at the time as a representative of the capitalist class. For this reason, plus the fact that I objected to the hypocritical line of the Communist Party as it worked out in Spain, as it worked out in the trade-union movement in this country in supporting Lewis, and as it worked out in China, Austria, and other countries, it seemed to me that it always worked to the exclusive aid of the Soviet Union, and that it was a policy that was not calculated to help the workers of the world.

I got so tired of listening to their hypocritical cant about helping the workers of the world in various campaigns that finally they got tired of my line of argument, whereupon they disciplined me by sending me to a course entitled "The Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union."

The longer I stayed in the Congress, the more apparent it became what a fake and fraud the whole thing had been, not only now but from the very basis and construction of the Comintern; that from the very beginning it meant nothing more than the extension of the policy of the Soviet Union. The whole policies of the Communist Party of the United States and of similar parties are utterly

unreal, are hypocritical, are centered on the policies of the Soviet Union, and not on the destiny and relation of the American people.

So, as might be expected. I was subsequently branded as a Fascist, and so forth and so forth, but I fully expected that, because I know that is the technique of the Communists, and it has been since the beginning.

Mr. MOSIER. Were you in the party under your own name?

Mr. DE SOLA. No; under the name of John Edward Gray. I believe you got that in previous testimony.

Mr. MOSIER. For a few months you were managing editor of Health and Hygiene, which was edited at the offices of the Communist Party as one of its publications; was it not?

Mr. DE SOLA. It was edited in the same structure where the Communist offices were, 15 East Thirteenth Street, or 35 East Twelfth Street.

Mr. MOSIER. You were editor of that publication, under the name of John Edward Gray?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes; but my name did not appear on the masthead; I was only editor for a short time, for 2½ months.

Mr. MOSIER. While you were editor, did you meet with any of the Communists, to decide on any of the policies of that magazine?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes.

Mr. MOSIER. Were those policies decided by the Communist group with whom you met?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes.

Mr. MOSIER. Was that magazine sold?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes; it was sold.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know what became of the proceeds of the sales?

Mr. DE SOLA. I was told by the fraction secretary there that after the expense incurred in distribution and printing had been paid that the proceeds would go back to the funds of the Communist Party.

Mr. MOSIER. As to the magazine, The New Pioneer, which you have exhibited to us, that is a magazine for children, is it not?

Mr. DE SOLA. That is correct.

Mr. MOSIER. That magazine is designed to inculcate into children's minds the principles of the Soviet Union?

Mr. DE SOLA. Well, yes; the principles largely of friendship and understanding of the Soviet Union, and at that time the principles that would lead to the assumption of power on the part of the Communist Party in this country.

Mr. MOSIER. Going now to the Federal writers' project in New York, you say the union activities of that project are dominated by the Workers' Alliance?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes.

Mr. MOSIER. And that the Workers' Alliance is dominated by the Communists within the Workers' Alliance?

Mr. DE SOLA. That is correct, I believe.

Mr. MOSIER. Do they distribute any literature among the writers on the Federal writers project, any communistic literature, or do they hold any meetings?

Mr. DE SOLA. They do not distribute any communistic literature, but they distribute their union publication called "Work." That, I believe, is distributed in front of the project about once a month.

I believe they have some agreement or arrangement with the administration by which means they hold shop stewards' meetings every Wednesday morning for about half an hour.

Mr. MOSIER. And the shop stewards' meetings are all dominated by the Communist element?

Mr. DESOLA. That I cannot say. It has been some time since I have been out of the Party, and there has been a tremendous turnover. A good many people come in for one reason or another, and a good many leave for one reason or another, and it is pretty hard to answer that question. Besides, I would not like to mention these people if I could, because I consider that all American people have the right to join these parties as long as they are legal parties, and if they make mistakes, and the party is as much in error as the Communist Party was and is, they will soon leave it.

Mr. MOSIER. Out of the approximately 200 or 300 employees on the Federal writers' project, what percentage of those would you say belong to the Workers' Alliance union?

Mr. DESOLA. I would say at least 80 percent.

Mr. MOSIER. That is, most of them join the Workers' Alliance?

Mr. DESOLA. Yes. I would not like to close that question and leave the possible impression that they were all Communists, by any means.

Mr. MOSIER. No; I am not saying that. What I want to find out is whether there is any pressure put on writers to make them join the Workers' Alliance, or is it simply ordinary persuasion?

Mr. DESOLA. I believe it is the ordinary persuasion that any union would use in its right to exercise on the job to get people in the job to join its ranks.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you help to prepare the guide?

Mr. DESOLA. Only in the very early days of the Federal writers' project, during the first few months of the operation.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you write some of the material?

Mr. DESOLA. Yes. I do not know whether it appears in the finished copy or not.

The CHAIRMAN. This committee has received evidence that communistic phraseology was inserted in the guide from some States here in Washington, in the offices in Washington. Do you know anything about that?

Mr. DESOLA. No; I do not. I believe there was some kind of an investigation in Massachusetts, where a guide book was issued, but I do not think that comes within the province of the New York City project.

The CHAIRMAN. This committee received testimony from public officials who have this matter within their jurisdiction, in executive session, that upon several different occasions, when the matter for the guide came to Washington, the Washington office would insert material along the line of class struggle, class hatred, and so on, and instruct the States offices to expand their lines to bring that in. Do you know anything about that?

Mr. DESOLA. I question that very much. In the early days of my editorship, we received quite contrary instructions which very much alarmed me as a loyal Communist, that we were not to class-angle anything.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the guide been printed yet?

Mr. DeSOLA. Yes; it has been printed.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know the man who is responsible, and whether he is a Communist?

Mr. DeSOLA. Yes; as I recall, it was Vincent Mague, and he is not a member of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. You say the book has been printed?

Mr. DeSOLA. Yes; it has been printed.

The CHAIRMAN. You have seen a copy of it?

Mr. DeSOLA. The New York City guide has been printed. Its title is—

The CHAIRMAN. The other guides are still with the printer?

Mr. DeSOLA. I think volume 2 of that is still with the printer.

The CHAIRMAN. You are talking about the New York City Guide?

Mr. DeSOLA. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I was referring to the State guide.

Mr. DeSOLA. I do not know anything about the New York State Guide. I think that is done from the office up in Albany.

The CHAIRMAN. How long is it since you worked on the city guide?

Mr. DeSOLA. It has been at least 2½ years. At that time we had instructions not to let in any class-angle material into it.

The CHAIRMAN. You were speaking of the hypocritical policy of the Communists; do you mean the policy of boring from within?

Mr. DeSOLA. No; I mean more specifically the policy of being all things to all men, shouting on yesterday that John Lewis was a labor faker, a tool of the capitalists, and then turning around in a few years with Lewis becoming the hero of the workers, and tomorrow, if there is a change in their policy, they are likely to turn around and say Lewis is a labor faker.

The CHAIRMAN. What dictates their change in policy?

Mr. DeSOLA. The internal events and pressure of the outside world on the affairs of the Soviet Union. Everything is subservient to the ends of the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they teach that?

Mr. DeSOLA. They do not teach that, but their lines are there for those who may read, and if you can interpret what you read everything would seem to lead to that as an entirely fair statement. That has been true since the days of Lenin.

The CHAIRMAN. You believe that primarily the Communist Party in the United States is dictated to by the Third Internationale?

Mr. DeSOLA. I know it.

Mr. MASON. May I ask, what caused the Communists to change their attitude toward John L. Lewis, classifying him first as a tool of the capitalists, and so on, and now considering him a hero for them?

Mr. DeSOLA. Well, at the time of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist Internationale, the whole line, all of the whole international line of approach had then passed from that of the International and changed; experience seemed to have taught them that the militant tactics of forming their own union and not trying to get into the A. F. of L. and boring from within, and smashing them up, was not a policy that worked to the advantage of the Soviet Union on many fronts.

So they then decided to about face and confine themselves to what they considered the most liberal element in any country that they could find, and they looked upon John L. Lewis, and people of his stamp, as the lesser of the two evils, and to make it appealing, they put John L. Lewis, and all of those with him, into the picture they painted then.

Mr. MASON. When was this change of tactics decided upon, at some international meeting?

Mr. DeSOLA. This was done at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist Internationale, held in Moscow.

Mr. MASON. In what year, on what date?

The CHAIRMAN. Was not that in 1936, when George Dimitroff—

Mr. DeSOLA. Yes; 1936.

The CHAIRMAN. When he made his famous speech?

Mr. DeSOLA. No; I think it was just before 1936. I am not exactly sure of the date at this time.

Mr. MASON. It was around 1935 or 1936?

Mr. DeSOLA. Yes; it was around that time when the line was changed.

The CHAIRMAN. What do they do under the present line of policy? Take the trade-union movement and other organizations; how do they go about it?

Mr. DeSOLA. Well, they are welcomed with open arms, Lewis and Martin, but not so much Martin, because he has been hard to deal with; he could not get their groups to work with him, but he got Lovestone to help him. They are attempting in a great number of groups to split them away from the A. F. of L., and they are very efficient in organization, but where the union organization is properly set up they are promptly kicked out or are in the process of being kicked out, and I think within a year, or a few months, they will have a changed line as to the Communist approach to the trade union situation.

The CHAIRMAN. What about other organizations, like the League for Peace and Democracy, or the International Labor Defense? Do you know anything about them?

Mr. DeSOLA. Yes; they did set up around them a number of innocent organizations, organizations composed of people who have humanitarian interests in one thing or another. If they can get them interested in opposition to war, for instance, they will get them organized into a society along that line. It is significant that what was formerly called the League Against War and Fascism was changed so that they could make an alignment they have been thinking about for some years, to get the so-called democratic nations, particularly England and France and this country, to line up with the Soviet Union in a war against the Fascist powers. They therefore had to change the name, because they did not want to do anything to alienate the pacific spirit. They had to bring out the idea that war, if on the side of the Soviet Union, would not be in the nature of an imperialistic war, but would be in the nature of a defensive war.

They had also gotten people interested in civil liberties to rally to the aid of every Communist, and they have gotten people interested in the plight of the various foreign people, both inside and outside of our borders.

Wherever they can get in a situation where human sympathy flows they will play on the sympathies of the people on the one hand, and they become kindly disposed toward them on the other, and all the time they have their members there who can inject their own line as smoothly as they can in these organizations, and get people to join the Communist Party on the argument that the Communist Party stands for everything that these people hold as most important to them.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice they had a meeting last night at which Bruce Bliven and Lewis Mumford were scheduled to meet in joint debate. But they agreed in practically everything. And at the end of the news item it says: "Asked from the audience how this Nation might cope with the threat of communism, Mumford said the question was too large for consideration at the moment. Bliven did not reply to a similar question."

Do any of these organizations ever denounce communism?

Mr. DE SOLA. No; they are unique and similar in one respect only, that they do not denounce any of the things that they claim very much to denounce touching the character and conduct of the Soviet Union and the policies practised by the Communist Party in this country.

In other words, they are for civil liberties and freedom, but if freedom and civil liberties are conducted as they have been in the Soviet Union, you would not find any of them in a picket line in front of the Soviet Embassy. They are for the right of free speech by their own party, but if any one else wants free speech, if they are on hand, they will give them the works. Therefore, liberty is all right, except as it applies to people in the Soviet Union or any place where they have power.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know who Mr. Bruce Bliven is?

Mr. DE SOLA. I believe he is one of the editors of the New Republic. That is all I know about him.

The CHAIRMAN. You say they seize advantage of every instance of persecution of communism? What would you say with reference to their concentrated efforts at this time? Have you observed the fact that they are all crying out loud against fascism and nazi-ism, at the same time being silent about communism? Are they now seeking to exploit the situation in certain countries involved, on the side of the Soviet Union?

Mr. DE SOLA. Absolutely; they are not only seeking to exploit the sympathies of the people as applied to the Jews in Germany, but they are not offering anything concrete. It is a fact that the Soviet Union has not made any offers to give those people asylum from persecution, as have other nations.

The CHAIRMAN. So, is it their purpose and policy to undertake to involve us in some foreign war in order to support Soviet Russia?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes; and they will try their level best, they would do anything to see that this country is kept in close touch with the Soviet Union, so that if they were engaged in war they would come to the aid of the Soviet Union.

They have always put that forward and all of their united front organizations are sooner or later lined up to defend the Soviet Union, because they see it as the fatherland of the workers, despite the

fact that there is nothing there, and that everything the Communists have fought for have been denied the people of the Soviet Union. But that is their intention.

The CHAIRMAN. You were talking about this New York City guide. You say you got instructions to not emphasize the class angle?

Mr. DeSOLA. Yes. I do not remember whether they were written instructions, but it was very well understood among all of the editors that we were not to permit any class-angle material to get into these books.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the necessity for such instructions?

Mr. DeSOLA. They were aware that there were a good many Communists and other leftists on the job who would try to push their line over, as they pushed it over in other publications.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know some of the front organizations? Is the League for Peace and Democracy one of their front organizations, too?

Mr. DeSOLA. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they control its policies?

Mr. DeSOLA. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the International Labor Defense?

Mr. DeSOLA. That is also one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about the connection between Mr. Roger Baldwin, who once wrote that he was in favor of communism and who is now secretary of the Civil Liberties Union, and the Communist Party?

Mr. DeSOLA. Despite the fact that he made that statement I believe Roger Baldwin to be a fairly sincere liberal.

The CHAIRMAN. How is it that a minority within the Communist Party is able to be so successful in directing the party?

Mr. DeSOLA. They are remarkably active. They are people who operate as any group of fanatics operate. They believe what they are doing. It is almost axiomatic that when you join the Communist Party you have had so many arguments put to you that you do not see any other move at the moment; you are broken down in some economic circumstances, so you are finally induced to put your experience and your conscience in cold storage.

You come in there and work as hard as you can work, and in a short time you find people around you seeing that you are active and your ideas will help the organization, and they invest you with power and they elect you to committees, and in a short time you and your kind are running the works, and, of course, you run them as nearly parallel as you can with the interests of the party.

You arrange meetings with your fellow Communists in which you work out these lines, and get certain people designated to get up on the floor at certain times and issue a motion and second a motion, and speak on a motion, and little by little, by those tactics, you are able to steam-roller your general program through.

The CHAIRMAN. From your experience in the Communist Party, to what extent would you say they are successful in controlling the organizations they enter?

Mr. DeSOLA. I would say they are remarkably successful, and in any organization they have not started in they pretty soon get control over the organization.

The American Civil Liberties Union, I think, is a fair example of an organization of that type. It originally was not composed of the members of the Communist Party, but very soon, by applied effort on their part, they were able to get control of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they conceal their Communist identity when they go into these organizations?

Mr. DESOLA. Oh, yes. At various meetings they get up and violently deny that they are Communists, and they will say they are for the aims of the organization. But they will say, "if this organization stands for peace, for security, for comfort, for the way of the American people, if that is Communism, then I am a Communist." They are demagogues of the first order.

The CHAIRMAN. What appeal do they have for young people? What did you find when you went into Communism; what class of young people do they appeal to?

Mr. DESOLA. That is pretty smooth and subtle. Their tactics were obviously based, when I was there, on the experience of the youth groups in Russia. They had so little more to offer American youth than the native youth groups that they had very few youngsters. Frequently the youngsters would plead with us that we give them something more like the Scouts had.

The CHAIRMAN. To what class did they most effectively appeal?

Mr. DESOLA. They try to give any help they can to any groups of working class children, children of members of the union, principally, children of members of the Communist movement.

The CHAIRMAN. They are fairly successful in coining phrases afterwards adopted by other people.

Mr. DESOLA. Yes; that is quite true.

The CHAIRMAN. Such as class struggle, reaction, and a good many other phrases that they use frequently, do they not?

Mr. DESOLA. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In their speeches to the front organizations.

Mr. DESOLA. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the purpose of these phrases; what part do they play in the Communist strategy?

Mr. DESOLA. They play a very important part. They soon discovered that the classical language of Marxism was a little too heavy for the American, and they began to find things equivalent with the idea that Communists have liberal inclinations, and would be afraid to say anything about the Communist Party or the Communist movement for fear that they will be branded as reactionary or as tools of Wall Street, or as agents of international Fascism, and so on.

It is a device to discourage people from thinking for themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how they are financed? Did you ever see anything that ever indicated any financing from abroad, while you were connected with the party?

Mr. DE SOLA. I heard lots of rumors of that sort, but never saw anything that would directly prove that. I did see some very intensive fund-raising drives on their part.

The CHAIRMAN. When they raise funds for other causes, like aid to the Spanish Loyalists, or aid to the Chinese, or aid to someone else, would you say, while you were in the party, that they kept a part of those funds?

Mr. DE SOLA. No; but when I left the party, I believe there was a statement given in the New York Times of the amount of the funds that had been collected by various organizations for Spain and the amount of money which reached Spain, and I believe, I think, out of a majority of these United Front organizations, less than one-third of the money collected ever got there.

The CHAIRMAN. You said a few moments ago that you knew the Communists were under the control of the Third International; in other words, the Third International dictated their policies. Do you mean to say that the Communist Party in the United States is really controlled by a foreign government?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Upon what do you base your statement that they are subject to the discipline of the Third International?

Mr. DE SOLA. Well, the history of the Communist Party in this country, for one thing; at one time, one of the secretaries—that is the leading post in the Communist Party in this country—one of the secretaries was J. Lovestone. He was opposed in the party election by a man who was prominent in the steel strike, called William Z. Foster. The party gave him a two-thirds vote in this country for reelection. They received, however, instructions from Moscow that the majority was wrong and the minority was correct, that the man who was to be elected was William Z. Foster. Lovestone was not reelected. He contested this high-handed piece of interference with party affairs, and he was expelled.

The CHAIRMAN. In their writings and the proceedings of the International, do they openly admit that the Third International controls the Communist Party's set-up in other countries?

Mr. DE SOLA. I believe they do. At the meeting of the Seventh World Congress in Moscow, referred to before, it was published in the party press in this country that the representatives of the French party, Marcel Cachin, of the Spanish party, Diaz, and of the American party, Browder, were there at the Congress and they shouted, "Long live Dimitrov, long live Stalin," and so on.

We know that they came back, and we know that when they came back, they brought us a new line of approach. We knew before they went over that there was a different line of approach. We know that the party leaders make constant trips to the Soviet Union.

We also know that in the deliberations of the central committee, not only of the Communist Party, but of the Young Communist League, a representative of the Comintern sits, a man who is responsible to Moscow.

In the deliberations of the Young Communist League, who are responsible for the publication of the New Pioneer, and the conduct of the children's movement, the Young Pioneers, I know that we always sat with a representative of the Young Communist International, who had a place similar to that of the representative of the Communist International who sits in at the meetings of the central committee. That is all true.

The CHAIRMAN. Your special assignment was among children?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you instructed as to how you were to propagandize?

Mr. DE SOLA. Well, not exactly. They are a little more subtle than that. They involve you in the work. Then they get you to argue out the line of work with them until they convince you, through argument, that their line is your line, and is the correct line of approach, then from that point you proceed to carry out the instructions of the party.

If, however, in some instances, you do not agree with their line, in fact, you disagree with their line so violently that there is no rectifying your error, you very soon find yourself expelled from the Communist Party.

The line is made upstairs, so to speak, by the heads, and comes down to you below. That is the structure of the party. They say that there is democracy within the Communist Party, but that is not true, and there has never been any of any account. They merely have meetings at which they ask you questions and have you ask them questions in order to clarify you as to how to carry on the work. But you do not discuss any way in which you would like the work to be carried on. In other words, they convince you of their line and that becomes your line.

The CHAIRMAN. How do they work through a publication like the New Pioneer? Will you explain that?

Mr. DE SOLA. Well, they have various members of the party who are gifted in several fields of expression on the editorial force; a person who knows about writing; a person who knows about photography; a person who knows about stamps, about art work, about boys' hobbies, games, songs, and so forth. These people are also members of the Communist Party usually and know the line of the Communist Party as it applies to these different fields.

And in the instructions that they give through the party press, the children's press, in this case the New Pioneer, and in the deliberations that they hold with school teachers and teachers' unions and other groups interested in youth, they press this party line to the fore as much as possible.

Of course, they do not give it any party labels, but to show an expression of opinion which has been arrived at before hand and is put forward in the most concerted and dynamic way that it can be put forward, so that it goes right through.

For example, in the back issues of the New Pioneer, if you will search them, you will find stories which will prove that George Washington was a reactionary, that while Lincoln had a part in the Civil War in freeing the slaves, he was nothing more than a middle class lawyer and really created a situation which split the country up further and removed the slaves from a feudal ownership and transferred them to an economic ownership; and so forth.

You can contrast that with the line of the party today which runs something like Lenin and Lincoln being great heroes of the American people. That is, these things are subject to change.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, they have adopted Lincoln and Washington and Jefferson now?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. They talk about twentieth century Americanism?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is not that their slogan?

Mr. DE SOLA. That is their hypocritical slogan.

The CHAIRMAN. How many children would be reached by these publications, would you say?

Mr. DE SOLA. Well, in the case of the New Pioneer, when I was there, probably not more than two or three thousand by direct subscription. However, a good number of subscriptions were made out in the names of different workers' clubs and trade unions that had children's groups, children's youth movements, and scout movements, and so forth, and a good number of kids might get hold of a single copy of one of these. It was considered a very good conspiratorial tactic on the part of the youngsters, who like to play at this game, because it was exciting to hide a copy of the New Pioneer in their geography book, sneak it into the school yard, and let the other kids take a peak at it. So probably a good many more read it than can actually be checked by the number sold.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there any other publication the Communists put out that appealed to the youth?

Mr. DE SOLA. The various youth organizations attached to them put out their own publications. I believe the International Workers Order had its youth organ that they took at one time.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the attitude of the New Pioneer toward the Boy Scout movement?

Mr. DE SOLA. Well, that has been also changed as the policy of the Comintern has changed, as the policy of the party in this country has changed in accordance with the Comintern change. At one time it was considered the smart and correct thing to do to go out and get a group of Boy Scouts and either challenge them to a fight or waylay them and beat them up. An expression of this can be seen in a humorous cartoon in the magazine The New Yorker, which shows a little Boy Scout coming home to his mamma, all betattered, and saying, "Mamma, the Pioneers beat me up."

This, however, was later changed, when they discovered that maybe all Boy Scouts were not agents of the capitalist class and young Fascists in the making, and they tried to unite with them and get in with their groups and have some fun and be good Boy Scouts themselves, and then put over their line, once they were in the Boy Scout group.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they followed that new line of policy?

Mr. DE SOLA. I believe they have. I do not know how successful they have been, because that has taken place since I have left the Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Much of their tactics or strategy appears on the face to be more or less fantastic, does it not?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that fact help them? I mean by that, if something is done fantastically, are not the people inclined to discredit it altogether and believe it is ridiculous?

Mr. DE SOLA. Well, I do not know. Perhaps they take a leaf from their rivals in Germany who believe that the more fantastic a thing is the more people will credit it. After all, I do not think the Communists differ from the Nazis and the Italian Fascists very much. They have other labels, and they claim to be enemies, but I think they are really rivals.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, all of them believe in a form of dictatorship?

Mr. DE SOLA. They believe in a form of dictatorship and they all appear to be fighting each other because they want to get control over more and more people by methods of a dictatorship.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you sincere when you went into the movement?

Mr. DE SOLA. I was quite sincere when I went into the movement. I believed the principles and aims of the Communist Party coincided with the principles that my own ancestors fought for in this country in '76. I had some doubts from time to time, some of their policies seemed quite fantastic and did not seem to be in line with the interpretation of American history as I had been taught it in the school, but I was assured that the history that I had been taught had been doctored to fit, that much of it was a lie, and that only the clear mind of a Marxist could tell me what had really happened. For a while I fell for this, but not for very long, as you can see.

The CHAIRMAN. You still have your idealistic viewpoint?

Mr. DE SOLA. I certainly have. I still want to see this Nation progress as far it can, but I am very much concerned that it does not progress along the lines that the Communists, the Nazis, and the Italian Fascists advocate.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is all.

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. Chairman, I think the record ought to show on behalf of the witness Halpern—and Mr. Halpern can correct me if I am wrong—that the witness appeared on the stand and stated that he had heard the testimony of Mr. De Sola and that he entered a denial of the accuracy of that testimony.

Mr. HALPERN. That is true.

Mr. MOSIER. I just wanted the record to show that for your benefit.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have a brother?

Mr. HALPERN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no sister?

Mr. HALPERN. Yes; I have a sister.

The CHAIRMAN. What is her name?

Mr. HALPERN. Grace.

The CHAIRMAN. Grace what?

Mr. HALPERN. Grace Hanover.

The CHAIRMAN. What is her business?

Mr. HALPERN. She is employed.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is she employed?

Mr. HALPERN. I really do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether or not your sister is a teacher in New York City?

Mr. HALPERN. Oh, no; she is not that.

The CHAIRMAN. She is not a teacher?

Mr. HALPERN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Has she ever taught?

Mr. HALPERN. No; she is not qualified to teach.

The CHAIRMAN. What is her husband's name?

Mr. HALPERN. Victor Hanover.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the same Hanover as the Hanover Sales Corporation?

Mr. HALPERN. No; he is a dentist.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, that is all.

TESTIMONY OF C. V. SUTCLIFFE

(The witness was duly sworn.)

The CHAIRMAN. Your name is C. V. Sutcliffe?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. You live at 55 Morton Street, New York City.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you connected with the writers' project?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. No; I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you ever connected with it?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes; I was.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you first become connected with it?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. November 1, 1935, a few days after the project was formally opened.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you do on the project?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. On the project, when I first went there, I was hired as an editor.

The CHAIRMAN. As an editor of what?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. As an editor of the New York guide book.

The CHAIRMAN. The city guide book?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Of the New York City guide book, yes; with Van Olinda and McCoy. Van Olinda was the state director for New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. And McCoy?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Was his assistant.

The CHAIRMAN. He is now in the Washington office, is he not?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Mr. Van Olinda is.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Mr. McCoy?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Mr. Sam McCoy is not connected with the project any more.

The CHAIRMAN. How long did you remain as an editor?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. I remained as an editor on the project until February 11, 1936, at which time, in company with 14 other people, I was transferred from the Federal writers' project to the Federal reporters' project.

The CHAIRMAN. Under whom?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Under Orick Johns and James Magraw.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you do after you got on that?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. After that I became a rewrite man on that desk. The duties were rewriting the reports that were brought in from all the projects of the City. There were five of us engaged in that capacity. That is, the reports were brought in by the leg men then rewritten in the form of publicity releases.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it part of your duties to take any photographs?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Not at that time. I was later on transferred at the request of Mr. De Sola to his department. I was doing rewrite work there. Then out of that grew the photographic assignment which I got, because it was necessary to provide some pictures for the books that he was putting out, and knowing that I was interested in camera work, I was asked to do so, and that I did.

Then, later on, when they set up a photographic department, I was a junior project supervisor and put in there under Mr. Robert Edwards, who was my supervisor. I was put into the photographic department.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have occasion to take photographs of the sit-down strikes that occurred?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes; I did.

The CHAIRMAN. What year did that occur?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. That was some time in the early summer, May, I believe; I am not sure of the month, but I think it was May 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you take those as part of your duties or on your own initiative?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. No; I did not. On the morning of the strike I came in as usual and went into the dark room and some, I suppose, half an hour later, three men came into the room wearing red arm bands, and told me to get out or I would get thrown out. So I left.

The CHAIRMAN. What do the red arm bands stand for?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Well, the red arm bands indicated they were members of the defense squad.

The CHAIRMAN. The defense squad?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes. That was one of the sections of the strike organization defense.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you get out?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes; I left. I left and went home and later went somewhere else. When I came back my wife told me several people had been down requesting me to come back up to the job. She did not understand for what purpose. This was about 5:30 or 6 o'clock in the evening. I went up to see what was going on and heard nothing. I was then asked by several people who were on the strike strategy committee, I learned later, if I would take some pictures for them for release to the newspapers. So I did make the photographs at their request throughout the strike which lasted from Monday until, I think, Friday or Saturday of that week. I do not recall when it terminated, but I think it was Friday or Saturday.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have those photographs with you?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes. They were handed to me by Mr. Birmingham here a few moments ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, how did he get them?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Mr. Birmingham subpoenaed them from me. That is, he subpoenaed the negatives.

The CHAIRMAN. You are here under subpoena?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And the negatives were subpoenaed?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And later developed?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had occasion to look at the photographs?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes; I have just leafed through them.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they the photographs you took?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. They are the photographs I took.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they represent actual scenes that took place during the strike?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes. They were all taken on the project during the strike, all except one. I do not know whether that is on the premises or off—no; they were all taken on the premises during the strike, or in front of the premises. There is one here that was made in December 1935 that has nothing to do with the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of these men had this red arm band that were engaged in this strike? How many did you notice?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. I do not know. It varied, according to who was in the building at the time or where they were in the building. I was shooting around all the time I was there, and I might have counted 10 or 40, according to the number of times I saw them. I should say there were, roughly, 25 people wearing arm bands.

The CHAIRMAN. Were they in charge of the strike?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. No; they were the police of the strike. It was their business to see that the place was policed properly.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you mean, policed properly; for whom?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Policed properly for the strike, to see that the strike was conducted along orderly lines, as far as their instructions went; and that meant checking up on the place, seeing that nothing was destroyed and also their principal function was to eject outsiders who had no business in their eyes on the property, and generally to defend the strike against incursions from the outside.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they do any singing while the strike went on?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Each evening they had some sort of a review on a stage made out of office tables, and there was a good deal of singing at the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you hear the Third International sung?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. I really do not recall; I did not pay much attention to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you hand me the first photograph and say what it is?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. This first one is a portion of the meeting as shown in exhibit B. Well, these are not in order. Shall I put them in order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; put them in order.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. The first picture shows the reception desk on the Federal writers' project during the sit-in strike. The man sitting at the desk is Abe Newman, who is also known as Abe Moskowitz, and as Abe Moscow.

The CHAIRMAN. What does he do there?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. He was a member of the defense squad. He is sitting there at the desk, with the only entrance unbarred in front. It was his place to pass on the eligibility of anybody who desired to enter or leave.

The CHAIRMAN. He worked on the project?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know in what position?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. I believe he was taken out of Mr. De Sola's department.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. De Sola, come over here, close to Mr. Sutcliffe and identify some of these people. The man sitting at the desk you have identified. Can you identify those in the back?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. The other one, with his arm against his shoulder, holding a sign, is Lonnie Schatzberg. He was a member of the defense squad.

The CHAIRMAN. There are two Negro women in the picture. Were they participating in the strike?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes, sir; they were in the strike. I do not know their names.

The CHAIRMAN. Does this man Moskowitz work on the Daily Worker?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. I have heard that he did, but I have never seen him down there.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. De Sola, can you say whether or not he worked for the Daily Worker?

Mr. DE SOLA. I believe he ran a sporting page there.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether, or not, he is a Communist?

Mr. DE SOLA. I believe so.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever see him attending any meetings of the Communists?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. The next photograph, B shows a crowd awaiting supper to be served on the premises of the Federal writers' project during the sit-in strike. The man facing the camera in the center background, with the felt hat, is Ivan Black, director of publicity for the radio division of the Federal theater project, in New York City.

These photographs were made on the premises and finished there under terrible conditions so far as finishing pictures were concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by that?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. I mean that the picture that was made had to be submitted to the strike committee for their approval. I do not know what they had in mind, but I was not going to use Government chemicals and everything else they had there. I had to make it with what chemicals I could scrape up outside.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. De Sola, can you identify any of the others in that picture?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir; there is a man here named Forest. He was apparently blinded by the flash. He is not a member of the Community Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Black a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Black was at the same time I was.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. He was executive secretary of the Writers' Union there, and preferred charges against me to have me fired from the project committee local.

The CHAIRMAN. For what?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. He took several hours to say what it was, but I did not know what it was after he got through. He demanded my dismissal.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they dismiss you from the project?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It was just from the union?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. I was not dismissed from anything.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. He demanded that I be dismissed from the Federal writers' project as a member of the union. He made that request, and sent telegrams to Mr. Hopkins about it.

The photograph C shows a section of the Federal writers' project consisting of proofing press and type fonts, being used to print strike passes and other material relative to the Federal writers' project sit-in strike. In there is a man handling the press, and that is Lonnie Schatzberg, a member of the defense squad, with the token of the

red arm band. Eva Mae Wright is at the font. The other man is named Solzatt.

Mr. MOSIER. What were they printing there?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Passes for the strike, so you could go in and out of the building.

Mr. MOSIER. All of this property that they were using, printing presses, type, and so forth, was Government property?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes, sir; that is a part of the map department.

Mr. MOSIER. They printed on it, using Government property for the purpose.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. De Sola, can you identify any of these people as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir; the people indicated by Mr. Sutcliffe are all members of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. They were all members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir; at the time I was.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. The photograph D shows the Negro section of the strike committee, meeting on the premises of the Federal writers' headquarters. There is only one figure here I can identify, and that is the Negro on the extreme left, Chappie Gardner. He works on the project, or did at that time.

Mr. DE SOLA. I know the faces of these people, but I do not know them by name. I do not know that any of them are in the Communist Party.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. The photograph E shows the women's temporary dormitory at the sit-in strike of the Federal writers' project, located in the supply room of the premises. I do not know anyone in there.

Mr. DE SOLA. I am afraid I do not know them.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. The next two pictures should be looked at together. The photograph F shows a portion of the defense squad wearing red arm bands, armed with crowbars guarding a barricaded door on the Federal writers' project during the sit-in strike. The card bearing the words "No pasaran" is a Loyalist Spain slogan.

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. De Sola, can you identify any of the three men in that picture?

Mr. DE SOLA. The one holding the crowbar is the aforementioned Lonnie Schatzberg. The man behind him I know by sight, but not by name. Underneath is a man who I believe is Joe Chawney. Directly under the center is a man named Solzatt.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. The photograph G shows the same section as F. It shows the barred doors at the sit-in strike at the Federal writers' project. The lone figure in it is the aforementioned Lonnie Schatzberg. He seems to be in most of these pictures for some reason or other. At the time these photographs were made, some of them were made expressly for distribution to the Left press in Loyalist Spain. That is the reason such expressions as "No pasaran" are included.

In the photograph H there is another picture for distribution in red Spain. The man in this photograph is a member of the strike defense squad. You will note the red band on his left arm. A sign is shown in the picture which says "Writers on strike."

Mr. DE SOLA. I do not know who the man is.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. I do not know who the man is in that.

The next picture I, shows a portion of the Jewish writers strike committee, which section seems to have its own committee in there. There are three shown there, none of whom I recognize, but they were members of the aforementioned committee.

Mr. DE SOLA. I have seen them on the project, but I do not know who they are.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. The photograph J shows propaganda speeches being made to street crowds by one of the stay-in strikers of the Federal writers' project, and also a member of the defense squad, as indicated by the red band on the left arm. These speeches were made by means of a loudspeaker or public address system brought there for that purpose.

Mr. DE SOLA. I believe the man's name is Pallock. I think you will find it in an issue of the Red Pen because you will see he is taking up some article there.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. I will now show photograph P. This picture was taken at the request of the strike strategy committee for distribution to Spanish Leftist newspapers.

One of the persons taken in this photograph, on the top line, is Willis Morgan, who was, I understand, the executive secretary of the city projects council. He was not a member of this project. Next to him is an unidentified Negro, and next to him is a Negro member of the project, Chappie Gardner. In the front row, from left to right is the aforementioned Abe Newman or Abe Moskowitz. Next to him is Beagal Smith. The next one is Marie Anderson, and the next is Max Arnold. In the corner is Julia Beller.

The CHAIRMAN. Were any of them members of the Communist Party?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. I cannot say.

Mr. DE SOLA. With the exception of Chappie Gardner, all of them were.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. This is a meeting of the strike strategy committee.

Mr. DE SOLA. You might call them a Communist faction.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. I will skip to the photograph R. This photograph shows a portion of the strike strategy committee, sitting in the premises of the Federal writers' project during the strike of 1937. In the center of the picture, seated at the desk, is a man known as Sol Becker, alias Carl Bristol, on the Daily Worker. Others in the picture are members of the Federal writers' project. This picture happens to be a Communist fraction. This shows in the photograph, from left to right, in the rear, an unidentified man. It shows Max Arnold, and the next is Abe Newman. In the center is Sol Becker, and on the extreme right is Julia Beller.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you identify any of them as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir; I can, but I believe they have already been identified at a previous hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. Were most of them members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. The photograph M, depicts the situation of the pay-off line of the Federal writers' project during the strike of 1937. At this time only strikers in good standing with the strike committee

were permitted in this line. Nonstrikers were paid off outside the building.

Mr. MASON. What do you mean by the "pay-off"?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. One day of the sit-in strike fell on pay day, and through an amicable arrangement, the strikers, or those that appear in this photograph, were permitted to sign the pay sheet and receive their pay.

Mr. MASON. Were they paid during the period they were on strike?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. They were paid for that period.

Mr. MASON. Were they paid later for the time during that period?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. It is my impression that they were permitted to make up the time.

Mr. MASON. By an amicable arrangement?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know that?

Mr. DE SOLA. I do not know. You might check it up in the department and find out.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. I know none of the people in this photograph.

Mr. DE SOLA. One of them is Abraham Arms. He is not a member of the party. Standing by the table is a man whose name I believe is Martin Wilkins, and I do not believe he is a member of the party.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you recognize any of them as a member of the party?

Mr. DE SOLA. No, sir; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. The photograph N depicts a portion of the picket line, parading in front of the Federal writers' headquarters during the strike in the spring of 1937. The American flag is carried by Angelo Herndon, a Negro. The sign proclaiming "The Dole an Un-American Institution," is carried by a Negro named Kumberbach. Parading behind the woman with the sign reading "Stop the New Deal Administration," and so forth is Harry Martell, who gave workers at a former Thirty-ninth Street strike their strike technique.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you recognize any of them as members of the Communist Party, Mr. De Sola?

Mr. DE SOLA. With the exception of Herndon and Martell, and possibly Kumberbach, I do not recognize anyone as a member.

The CHAIRMAN. They were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. Herndon was under sentence at that time, was he not?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Angelo Herndon, I believe, at the time, was out under an appeal from his sentence for the distribution of seditious literature intended to incite riot in Atlanta. He came as did other outsiders, like Willis Morgan, simply to support the strike.

Mr. MOSIER. They were not employed on the writers' project?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. No, sir.

Mr. MOSIER. They were outsiders coming in there to help.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead with the next.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. The photograph O shows a portion of the picket line with Angelo Herndon, Negro, carrying the American flag. Herndon at that time was out on bail on an appeal from a 20-year jail sentence imposed by a Georgia court for distribution of seditious literature and inciting to riot.

The photograph P was taken at the request of the strike strategy committee, for distribution to the Spanish Leftist newspapers. There are a number of people in here, including Eva Mae Wright, Bill Fox, Esther Book, Lena Presser, B. Goldsmith, Solzatt, Florence Kleinman, Mutter Pearl, Ruth Reich, and J. Grulich. The photograph shows a card reading "Striking writers support Spanish democracy." They are shown giving the Communist salute, with raised clenched fists.

The CHAIRMAN. All of them are on the project?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. Yes, sir. This was taken at the request of the strike strategy committee.

Mr. DE SOLA. They seem to be the right people that Mr. Sutcliffe mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. Were they members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Bill Fox, I do not believe is, and I do not believe that Mutter Pearl is. I do not think that is true of Ruth Reich.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the rest of them?

Mr. DE SOLA. The rest of them mentioned are. Some of those mentioned are not. I do not know the individuals by name, but I do not believe they are.

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. The photograph Q shows a portion of the same meeting as the one shown in exhibit B. Willis Morgan is the second figure from the left, wearing glasses, and is conversing with a man known as Kirsten. The Negro, the fourth from the left, is a theatrical promoter employed on the project, and is known as Chappie Gardner.

Mr. DE SOLA. The people's names correspond to the people in the picture, with the exception of an unidentified young man with a beard, whom I do not know. There are two Negroes there including Chappie Gardner. The other people I do know to be members of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is Willis Morgan?

Mr. DE SOLA. Willis Morgan, when I was there, was executive secretary. I believe his title was head of the city projects council. That was later affiliated or confederated into a number of other organizations that formed the Workers Alliance. I think he is functioning at the present time as the head of the white-collar workers.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that cover all the photographs?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. There is a photograph not connected with this, made during the fall of 1935, shortly after the inception of the Federal writers' project. This photograph depicts how pressure was brought to bear for the elimination of Van Alinda, then director of the Federal writers' project in the city of New York. The man carrying the first sign on the left is Ivan Black, at present a publicity director on the Federal writers' project. The man carrying the "Oust Van Alinda" sign is Konecky. The picture was taken in front of the headquarters on East Thirty-second Street, New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Konecky?

Mr. SUTCLIFFE. He has held a number of supervisory jobs on the project. He did at the time I left.

Mr. DE SOLA. I do not recognize any of them except the man standing across the street, Bob Craig, and he is not a member of the party.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Konecky a member of the party?

Mr. DE SOLA. Konecky was at the time I was.

(The photographs above referred to were marked "Sutcliffe Exhibit No. 1, November 21, 1938." and filed with the committee.)

(In connection with Mr. Sutcliffe's testimony, copies of the Pioneer were submitted and filed with the committee.)

The CHAIRMAN. Before we close, Mr. De Sola, will you explain what was the purpose of the statement about Mr. Bob Hall.

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir. I went up to the section with my weekly reports. Various secretaries would report to the section organizer, or to the staff section organizer, and along with me the unit organizer would go, with the financial secretary, the literature agent, and people who were entrusted with various jobs for the Communist Union on the writers' project. The financial secretary would always give his report to Mr. Hall, and at full meetings of the section committee Mr. Hall would appear. When I was expelled from the party, I was called in. They held some sort of star chamber proceeding in which they tried to get me to sign papers that I was all kinds of S. B.'s, if I may use the expression, and a Trotskyite, which I was not. Among those who entered into the discussion, in this mock trial that the party held, was the same gentleman who denied a few moments ago that he was Mr. Hall, or the so-called Bob Hall. He made a somewhat threatening remark, that if I look at him again, he was sure I would say he was not Mr. Hall.

I want to formally and publicly object very much to that remark, because I think it carries a veiled threat.

The CHAIRMAN. Why does it?

Mr. DE SOLA. Because it is a well-known fact that people who get in the position that circumstances now put me in, in violent opposition to the Communist Party because of conflict with their principles, that the party will go to any length to exterminate them. There was a case some years ago, which was reported in the press, of a Communist leader, Mrs. Stewart Poins, who broke with the party, and some member of the Soviet secret-police organization was promptly called, and a check-up was made of members and inquiries were made through the State Department, and to this day no one has ever heard of Mrs. Stewart Poins. But we do know that she violently opposed the Communist Party, and suddenly disappeared from the scene.

Mr. MOSIER. Do you know whether this Bob Hall, who has appeared here this afternoon, has any other name than Bob Hall?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir; I believe that his name in private industry was Robert Halpern. I believe that was his name.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you understand while you were in the party that he had some official connection with the Moscow Government, with the Soviet Government; that he was a go-between and a spokesman on financial matters here?

Mr. DE SOLA. No, no. I heard—this is purely rumor—I heard that he was tied up with some official Soviet agency; just what I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether or not any members of the Soviet Embassy here were in contact with Robert Hall?

Mr. DE SOLA. That I could not say; I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. What was his status as you understood it?

Mr. DE SOLA. He was financial secretary of section 24; he was a member of the leading committee, the section committee of section 24 of the Communist Party in New York.

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. De Sola, did you have any information to the effect that this Bob Hall, alias Halpern, is also known as Hamilton?

Mr. DE SOLA. No; I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have occasion at any time, when you went to his offices, to see any member of the Soviet Embassy present?

Mr. DE SOLA. No; I did not. I do not know any of the members of the Soviet Embassy.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you come in contact with any of the officials of the Amtorg in New York?

Mr. DE SOLA. Only one, and that was not in the capacity of any function of the Communist Party. I came in contact with one of their agents here.

The CHAIRMAN. You know of no activities of this Bob Hall other than the ones you have related?

Mr. DE SOLA. No; and what I learned this afternoon as I sat here and heard part of his testimony to you.

Mr. MOSIER. Mr. De Sola, did you know, at the time you were a member of the Communist Party, that this Bob Hall, to whom you were making reports, also went under the name of Halpern?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes.

Mr. MOSIER. You knew that at the time?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes.

Mr. MOSIER. You gave that name, in fact, to Mr. Birmingham, one of our investigators, did you not?

Mr. DE SOLA. When he asked me if I also knew that was his name, I admitted that I knew that was his name.

Mr. MOSIER. And that was the name under which Mr. Birmingham prepared and served the subpoena of this committee?

Mr. DE SOLA. That I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know that Mr. Bob Hall was prominently identified in the sale of Soviet bonds, throughout the country?

Mr. DE SOLA. That I had heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether or not the Communists took an active part in selling those bonds over the country?

Mr. DE SOLA. I think they did take a fairly active part. The arguments ran something like this: That the capitalist structure of this country was very weak and shaky, and likely to break down at any moment; that workers could not safely entrust their funds to our regular institutions and channels of financial savings, and that the best and most loyal thing to do was to buy a Soviet security of some sort; that workers who had any savings were urged to buy a Soviet security of one sort or another.

The CHAIRMAN. That propaganda was carried on in your meetings at various times while the sale took place?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether any of the funds in the treasury of the Communist Party were invested in these bonds?

Mr. DE SOLA. That I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever see any high ranking Communist present at any time when you went to see Bob Hall?

Mr. DE SOLA. None higher than the leader of section 24.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was he?

Mr. DE SOLA. Sam Brown.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you recall the strike that the photographs depict?

Mr. DE SOLA. Yes; I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the Communists within the W. P. A. start that strike?

Mr. DE SOLA. Well, to the extent that they were the responsible leaders in the Workers Alliance, and in the Workers Alliance local of the project, I do not imagine that unless they had counseled the local that this was the course of action, that this action would have been taken. It is reasonable to suppose that under other circumstances, where the workers were threatened with firing, they might have instituted such action without Communist help.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not mind staying here tomorrow, Mr. De Sola?

Mr. DE SOLA. No, indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of anyone within the party that knows more about the activities of Bob Hall and the activities of the Amtorg and this whole proposition of selling bonds throughout the country?

Mr. DE SOLA. No; I do not believe I do. In fact, he would know more than anyone that I could think of. If you cross-examine him, I am sure you can find out a great deal.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is a conclusion. My conclusion would be the opposite. I doubt very seriously if we get anything from him.

We will suspend until tomorrow at 10:30.

(Thereupon the subcommittee adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 22, 1938, at 10:30 o'clock a. m.)



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05445 2451

